

**SUPERIOR COURT
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA, STATE OF
ARIZONA**

A Private for profit governmental services Corporation

STATE OF ARIZONA - DUN AND BRADSTREET)
#072459266)
ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SAFETY)
Dun and Bradstreet #078291672)
A private registered legal business entity)
A subsidiary corporation of UNITED STATES Corporation)
Two De Facto for Profit Governmental Services Corporations)

VS

JESSICA MANN KAHRAMAN dba)
An artificial entity created through fraud,)
and Unlawful Conversion of natural Name)
by the STATE OF ARIZONA)
A living Woman unlawfully Convicted,)
the woman being involuntarily held as surety)
appearing By special appearance of Jessica Mann; Kahraman)
A Living Soul, A woman of GOD, Bondservant of Christ, Non Personam, Sui Juris)
a Non-representative/Non-agent)

CC: US Army Provost Marshal General, Notified in Writing
CC: US Commerce Secretary, Notified in Writing
CC: UN Secretary of Human Rights, Notified in Writing



**This in its entirety is,
a Living Testimony in form of an Affidavit;
a Challenge of my Rights, Status, Standing & Jurisdiction;
a Notice of Discovery of Fraud and Impropriety;
An Abatement;
a Demand for Remedy; and a Claim for Compensation.**

Notice to principal is notice to agent, Notice to agent is notice to principal.

I hereby pray to God for relief and command the administrator as public servant of "We the People" to read this thoroughly, completely and with comprehension, this document is of a very serious nature and is not frivolous.

There will be no presumptions or assumptions, no Tacit agreements, no waiver of rights, no hearsay, no lawyering or attornment from the bench.

I am asking only for Truth, Facts, Honor and Fair Justice.

Rights

Above all else, I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, in and from the beginning, invoke my right of self determination which is considered to be the foundational stone of all human rights. I hereby invoke my right of redress of grievances.

I hereby stand as a belligerent claimant upon these rights as required

The Supreme Court said that the "rights of life and personal liberty are the natural rights of man. To secure these rights ... governments are instituted among men" U.S. v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542, 2 Otto 542, 23 L. Ed. 588

The individual Rights guaranteed by our Constitution and treaties cannot be compromised or ignored by our government or by its courts.

For example, in United States v. Johnson, 76 F. Supp. 538, 539 (D. Pa. 1947), Federal District Court Judge James Alger Fee ruled that,

... "The privilege against self-incrimination is neither accorded to the passive resistant, nor to the person who is ignorant of his rights, nor to one indifferent thereto. It is a FIGHTING clause. Its benefits can be retained only by sustained COMBAT. It cannot be claimed by attorney or solicitor. It is valid only when insisted upon by a BELLIGERENT claimant in person." *McAlister vs. Henkel*, 201 U.S. 90, 26 S.Ct. 385, 50 L.Ed. 671; *Commonwealth vs. Shaw*, 4 Cush. 594, 50 Am.Dec. 813;

Orum vs. State, 38 Ohio App. 171, 175 N.E. 876.

"The one who is persuaded by honeyed words or moral suasion to testify or produce documents rather than make a last ditch stand, simply loses the protection. He must refuse to answer or produce, and test the matter in contempt proceedings, or by habeas corpus." [Emphasis added.]

Notice the verdict's confrontational language in these Cases:

"fighting", "combat", and most surprising, "belligerent". Did you ever expect to ever read a Federal Court condemning people for being "passive" or "ignorant"? Did you ever expect to see a verdict that encouraged people to be "belligerent" in COURT...?

Better go back and re-read that extraordinary verdict. And commit it to memory, for it succinctly describes the essence of the American legal system.

Clearly, we must do SOMETHING, for as Sir Edmund Burke said, "The only thing necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing."

"The presumption of Liberty, rights we retain for ourselves. Freedom lies in everyone's heart, but it must do more than just lie there." Judge Napolitano

"Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,"

(Excerpt of Preamble of - Universal Declaration of Human Rights)

"The States Parties to the present Covenant, Considering that, in accordance with the principles proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations, recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world, Recognizing that these rights derive from the inherent dignity of the human person, Recognizing that, in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the ideal of free human beings enjoying civil and political freedom and freedom from fear and want can only be achieved if conditions are created whereby everyone may enjoy his civil and political rights, as well as his economic, social and cultural rights, Considering the obligation of States under the Charter of the United Nations to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and freedoms, Realizing that the individual, having duties to other individuals and to the community to which he belongs, is under a responsibility to strive for the promotion and observance of the rights recognized in the present Covenant."

(Preamble - International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights)

By the grace of God almighty, and through the supremacy clause of the Constitution and the below-listed treaties of supreme law, it is I alone, who shall determine my status, standing, honor and jurisdiction.

Article. VI. Clause 2: This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, **shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby**, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.

Clause 3: The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious Test shall ever be required as a Qualification to any Office or public Trust under the United States.

I hereby invoke and stand upon all my natural rights, given by my God, which are written in the documents listed below. These, and all others, are universally known as supreme law of the land:

- The Holy Bible, KJV 1611 **GOD's Law's are Superior Law**
- 1215 Magna Charta
- 1606 The First Charter of Virginia
- 1620 Mayflower Compact
- 1628 Petition of Rights
- 1641 Grand Remonstrance
- 1689 English bill of rights
- 1765 The Declaration of rights in congress at New York
- 1774 The Declaration of rights in congress at Philadelphia
- 1775 The Declaration of Arms
- 1776 The Virginia Declaration of rights

- 1776 Declaration of Independence
- 1777 the Articles of Confederation
- 1783 Treaty of Peace
- 1787 Northwest Ordinance
- 1789 The Constitution for the United States of America
- 1791 The Bill of Rights
- 1868 The Constitution of The United States of America
- 1864, 1929 and 1949 The Geneva Conventions
- 1948 The Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- 23 March 1976 The International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights,
Articles 1-27*

I, hereby and forever **stand firm** upon these **natural rights** listed above, giving the free man of god, one of "We the People", the state National, Limited Diplomatic Immunity as per the Geneva convention, in that he has done no harm to another. If I, have unknowingly harmed another let that living Man, Woman, or Child, come forward claim under sworn oath and under the penalty of perjury, and I'll explain, ask for repentance, seek forgiveness, and make amends or rebut.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR):
(partial list of applicable rights) Article

1

1. All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

3. The States Parties to the present Covenant, including those having responsibility for the administration of Non-Self-Governing and Trust Territories, shall promote the realization of the right of self-determination, and shall respect that right, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations.

Article 2

1. Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the present Covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

2. Where not already provided for by existing legislative or other measures, each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to take the necessary steps, in accordance with its constitutional processes and with the provisions of the present Covenant, to adopt such laws or other measures as may be necessary to give effect to the rights recognized in the present Covenant.

3. Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes:

- (a) To ensure that any person whose rights or freedoms as herein recognized are violated shall have an effective remedy, notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity;
- (b) To ensure that any person claiming such a remedy shall have his right thereto determined by competent judicial, administrative or legislative authorities, or by any other competent authority provided for by the legal system of the State, and to develop the possibilities of judicial remedy;
- (c) To ensure that the competent authorities shall enforce such remedies when granted.

Article 3

The States Parties to the present Covenant undertake to ensure the equal right of men and women to the enjoyment of all civil and political rights set forth in the present Covenant.

Article 5

1. Nothing in the present Covenant may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms recognized herein or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for in the present Covenant.

2. There shall be no restriction upon or derogation from any of the fundamental human rights recognized or existing in any State Party to the present Covenant pursuant to law, conventions, regulations or custom on the pretext that the present Covenant does not recognize such rights or that it recognizes them to a lesser extent.

Article 6

Every human being has the inherent right to life. This right shall be protected by law. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life.

Article 7

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation.

(There is EXCESSIVE torture, cruel, inhuman & degrading treatment and punishment in our jails & prisons! [See 1971 Stanford Prison Experiment. "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely!"])

Article 8

1. No one shall be held in slavery; slavery and the slave-trade in all their forms shall be prohibited.

2. No one shall be held in servitude.

3.

(a) No one shall be required to perform forced or compulsory labour;

(What about the Prison Industrial Complex's role in Human Trafficking and Racketeering? [There are contract\$ and bond\$ that require prisoners to fill the beds of jails and prisons {Human Warehouses}!]) (Some jails are even OWNED by county judges like!)

Article 9

1. Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention. No one shall be deprived of his liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedure as are established by law.

2. Anyone who is arrested shall be informed, at the time of arrest, of the reasons for his arrest and shall be promptly informed of any charges against him.

3. Anyone arrested or detained on a criminal charge shall be brought promptly before a judge or other officer authorized by law to exercise judicial power and shall be entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release. It shall not be the general rule that persons awaiting trial shall be detained in custody, but release may be subject to guarantees to appear for trial, at any other stage of the judicial proceedings, and, should occasion arise, for execution of the judgement.

4. Anyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings before a court, in order that that court may decide without delay on the lawfulness of his detention and order his release if the detention is not lawful.

5. Anyone who has been the victim of unlawful arrest or detention shall have an enforceable right to compensation.

Article 10

1. All persons deprived of their liberty shall be treated with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the human person.

3. The penitentiary system shall comprise treatment of prisoners the essential aim of which shall be their reformation and social rehabilitation. Juvenile offenders shall be segregated from adults and be accorded treatment appropriate to their age and legal status.

Article 11

No one shall be imprisoned merely on the ground of inability to fulfill a contractual obligation.

Article 12

1. Everyone lawfully within the territory of a State shall, within that territory, have the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence.

2. Everyone shall be free to leave any country, including his own.

Article 14

1. All persons shall be equal before the courts and tribunals. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, or of his rights and obligations in a suit at law, everyone shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The press and the public may be excluded from all or part of a trial for reasons of morals, public order or national security in a democratic society, or when the interest of the private lives of the parties so requires, or to the extent strictly necessary in the opinion of the court in special circumstances where publicity would prejudice the interests of justice; but any judgement rendered in a criminal case

or in a suit at law shall be made public except where the interest of juvenile persons otherwise requires or the proceedings concern matrimonial disputes or the guardianship of children.

2. Everyone charged with a criminal offense shall have the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law.

3. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, everyone shall be entitled to the following minimum guarantees, in full equality: (a) To be informed promptly and in detail in a language which he understands of the nature and cause of the charge against him;

- (b) To have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defense and to communicate with counsel of his own choosing;
- (c) To be tried without undue delay;
- (d) To be tried in his presence, and to defend himself in person or through legal assistance of his own choosing; to be informed, if he does not have legal assistance, of this right; and to have legal assistance assigned to him, in any case where the interests of justice so require, and without payment by him in any such case if he does not have sufficient means to pay for it;
- (e) To examine, or have examined, the witnesses against him and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him;
- (f) To have the free assistance of an interpreter if he cannot understand or speak the language used in court;
- (g) Not to be compelled to testify against himself or to confess guilt.

5. Everyone convicted of a crime shall have the right to his conviction and sentence being reviewed by a higher tribunal according to law.

6. When a person has by a final decision been convicted of a criminal offense and when subsequently his conviction has been reversed or he has been pardoned on the ground that a new or newly discovered fact shows

conclusively that there has been a miscarriage of justice, the person who has suffered punishment as a result of such conviction shall be compensated according to law, unless it is proved that the nondisclosure of the unknown fact in time is wholly or partly attributable to him.

7. No one shall be liable to be tried or punished again for an offense for which he has already been finally convicted or acquitted in accordance with the law and penal procedure of each country.

Article 15

1. No one shall be held guilty of any criminal offense on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a criminal offense, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time when the criminal offense was committed. If, subsequent to the commission of the offense, provision is made by law for the imposition of the lighter penalty, the offender shall benefit thereby.

2. Nothing in this article shall prejudice the trial and punishment of any person for any act or omission which, at the time when it was committed, was criminal according to the general principles of law recognized by the community of nations.

Article 17

1. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary or unlawful interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to unlawful attacks on his honor and reputation.

2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

Article 18

1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion. This right shall include freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice, and freedom, either individually or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching.
2. No one shall be subject to coercion which would impair his freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of his choice.

Article 19

1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.
2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.

I get that, the STATE OF ARIZONA through its Unlawful Conversion created the ALL CAPITAL fiction variation of the christian name my PARENTS gave me. The STATE didn't create anything that is real and living. It was GOD who created me. It was GOD who endowed my parents with the ability to co-create with Him to bring me into this world and to raise me.

The government public servants are TRUSTEES.

I am the BENEFICIARY.

One of "We the People" creators of Government.

Now let's see what the Constitution has to say about our Rights.

BILL OF RIGHTS.

SECTION I.

Paragraph I. All government, of right, originates with the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole. Public officers are the trustees and servants of the people, and, at all times, amenable to them.

Par. II. Protection to person and property is the paramount duty of government, and shall be impartial and complete.

Par. III. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, except by due process of law.

Par. IV. No person shall be deprived of the right to prosecute or defend his own cause in any of the Courts of this State, in person, by attorney, or both.

I am not a federal citizen. I am a State National and claim my Nationality as such. Arizona is a member nation State of the union.

A Declaration of independence was a Declaration of Trust. A constitution is how a CORPORATION OR TRUST operates, The Articles Of Confederation was also a Constitution.

Grantor: WE THE PEOPLE

Beneficiary: We the people

TRUSTEE: PUBLIC OFFICERS

Look up "Trustee". YOU CANNOT USE TRUSTEE WITHOUT IT BEING A TRUST. That Sums it up right there.

This is the PUBLIC OFFICERS CONTRACT. THE CONSTITUTION IS THE TRUST INDENTURE FOR THE PUBLIC OFFICERS AKA. SERVANTS TO THE BENEFICIARY.

Here I shall stand, rescinding all past contracts, agreements
or
waivers of rights for Cause of Fraud.

I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, hereby repudiate, revoke and rescind any waiver I may have previously made of these rights, unknowingly, unwittingly, under duress, under coercion, forced upon me through fearful scare tactics, under lies, under any false assumption or presumption, or through any perceived Tacit agreement, or by any signature, which may have been used by a fictional corporate officer registered by my all caps name of some fraudulently created dead entity, or vessel lost at sea, or transmitting utility, created by government and recorded as Human Resources and used as Human Capital by an investment bond or note created in Dog Latin Glossa NAME through fraud and personage of a bonded and insured birth registration that is Sold on the market under a CUSIP # through U.S. treasury bonds bundled in an LEI, and regulated by the SEC.

See GMEIUtility.org or fidelity.com

See also Department of Fiscal Services web pages

American Jurisprudence 2nd 1964 vol. 16 § 373 **Rights of Contract**

Liberty of contract involves, as one of its essential attributes, the right to terminate contracts, Valid contracts are property and as such are protected from being taken without just compensation. The United States Supreme Court has stated that freedom to contract is the essence of freedom from undue restraint

on the right to contract. Other courts have stated that the liberty to make contracts includes the corresponding right to refuse to accept a contract or to assume such liability as may be proposed. The right of liberty of contract is inherent and inalienable. It belongs to everyone by the law of the land; every man has the right freely to deal, or to refuse to deal, with his fellow men. Pg.

706 – 707

American Jurisprudence 2nd 1964 vol. 16 § 362 **Nature of Right guaranteed**
 The right of property is a fundamental, natural, inherent, and inalienable right...
 In fact, it does not owe its origin to the constitutions which protect it, for it existed before them. It is sometimes characterized judicially as a sacred right, the protection of which is one of the most important objects of government. Pg.

691

This Means to take away one's **RIGHT TO REFUSE CONTRACT** with anyone is to take away "The right of property" A Right that's guaranteed... and un-a-lien-able!

U.S.C. Title 18 § 241: Conspiracy Against Rights

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten or intimidate any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or If two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premise of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege so secured - They shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results, they shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

U.S.C. Title 18 § 242: Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains or penalties, on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined not more than \$1000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both; and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life.

The Supreme Court has warned:

"Because of what appear to be Lawful commands on the surface, many citizens, because of their respect for what appears to be law, are cunningly coerced into waiving their rights, due to ignorance." (U.S. v. Minker, 350 U.S. 179, 187)

Challenge of Standing

Only a righteous and lawful, Living man or woman can have standing! Only a man or woman is born alive. Only a man or woman has unalienable rights!

These rights, given by God, are superior law. These rights are referenced in the multiple documents and treaties listed above and are known in this UNITED STATES as supreme law.

All government, corporations, agencies, agents, officers, in every level of government and in every state, county, municipality, and in every capacity, must obey this Constitution and these treaties if they are brought forward into the light. For this, SUNLIGHT is the best disinfectant.

No Legal Person, Entity created under The Dog Latin ALL-CAPS name, a vessel, a transmitting utility, a corporation, can stand, as all are dead, they have NO standing, they can not speak, they can NOT be the creditor, they can NOT be the holder in due course.

"Ens legis. L. Lat. A creature of the law; an artificial being, as contrasted with a natural person. Applied to corporations, considered as deriving their existence entirely from the law." Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, 1951

Genesis 2:7 And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul.

I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, as a woman, as a living soul, Stand upon my rights and refuse to be held as the surety for the bond in trust.

Challenge of Status

Being a woman of God, a living soul, of flesh and blood, of sound mind, intelligent and of competent nature, the creditor, beneficiary and holder in due course of the trust. I am, an honorary member and proud descendent of "We the People" as creator and arbitrator of government. My DNA existed upon these shores before government. I am NOT one artificially created by government such as "Citizen", "Person", or "Resident".

For it is my estate and the estates of my fathers and grandfathers, back many years, as I am alive upon the land. I am the holder in due course, the rightful beneficiary, and I hereby command the administrator as the fiduciary to settle and dismiss this matter.

I have previously repudiated my citizenship via affidavit to the President of the UNITED STATES, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, of the UNITED STATES. As well as to the Attorney General of the STATE wherein I was born upon the Land. I am a State National, a Bloodline American, one of "We the People" of these the united "States of America".

Again, I am not a U.S. Citizen, but I am a State National, as described in USC 8 § 1101 (a) 21 with limited diplomatic immunity as one who created government as per Geneva Conventions.

As a "non-resident alien," to DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, or to the IMF, my estate and/or trust is, as described in 26 USC § 7701 (a)(31), as a TAX-EXEMPT "foreign estate or trust."

"A 'citizen of the United States' is a civilly dead entity operating as a co-trustee and co-beneficiary of the PCT (public Charitable Trust), the constructive, Cestui Que Vie trust of US INC. Under the 14th Amendment, which upholds the debt of the USA and US INC."

Congressional Record, June 13, 1967, pp. 15641-15646

The Defendant, As Charged above, is described as a DEAD ENTITY. As such, it has no Labor to earn on its own, through its own efforts, or its own blood, sweat and tears, so is therefore IN-capable on its face of giving remedy to the STATE OF ARIZONA CORPORATION. Nor can the fictional entity, the STATE OF ARIZONA bring its jurisdiction against the man. Only against the "person" which I refute as fraud, because it is a creation of the State.

"I set out on this ground which I suppose to be self evident, 'that the earth belongs in usufruct to the living,' that the dead have neither powers nor rights over it." Thomas Jefferson in letter to James Madison; criticizing the new constitution September 6th 1789

At some point in time, one recognizes the fraud. As I the woman, have awakened to the fact that it is I, the living woman whose blood, sweat and tears, of her labor, the woman's, that has been fraudulently held as the surety and as the debtor, when in reality it is I, that is truly the holder in due course and the actual creditor.

But Alas! The government corporation deems that the man is "LOST AT SEA" by his very (E)state, while his employees (the Government, Corporations) steal the fruits of his labor.

I, would like to remind you that the act of either remaining a "U.S. citizen" or becoming one is a voluntary, revocable act according to the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *United States v. Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542. All citizenship is a product of intent and domicile, and it has never been my intent to be a "U.S. citizen" as defined in 8 U.S.C. §1401 while it has always been my intent to be a "national" per 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) but not a STATUTORY "U.S. citizen" per 8 U.S.C. §1401:

Challenge of Jurisdiction

In Genesis 1: 26-28 God gave man(kind) dominion over the three Jurisdictions: Land, Air, Water, and everything therein. This became the origin of LAW.

Latter Moses brought down from the mount the Ten Commandments this became known also as God's law.

And then, there came the following: The first three Testamentary Trusts

- In 1455, The Romanus Pontifex;
- in 1481, The Aeterni Regis;
- in 1537, The Convocation;

...all of the first three testamentary trusts combined set the specific three jurisdictions of the LAW...

Land; Common Law, of "we the people" natural, man/woman, national in nature. Originally King of Spain as trustee but later given to all mankind.

Air; Ecclesiastical law, Canon law, moral, souls, trusts, global in nature. Vatican as trustee.

Water; Admiralty law or Commerce; shipping, vessels, ports, goods, tax, international in nature. Contractual in nature. Persons, Entities, Corporations, Employees, residents. British Monarchy as trustee. The Crown inc. The BAR Association.

These are the **ONLY** three jurisdictions, all with their **separate and distinct languages.**

***Definition of "jurisdiction"; Juris,**
means "law" + **diction**, means "words".
The words you use determine in which of the three jurisdictions **you stand**. We are not well-educated through the governments public schools, and its Public propaganda educational system. We learn only what they want us to learn. And because the overwhelmingly vast majority of government leaders are BAR Association members, then why are we not taught the language and Jurisdictions differences of LAW? Why are we not taught the law? Why?

In fact, it seems this and other pieces of the puzzle were **hidden on purpose**, as a way to dumb us down to facilitate the taxing of the poor, through our courts, in order to make a **profit**. **I ask, Can this be constructive fraud?**
It's definitely not full and honest disclosure of the facts.

Here is an Example of

Land / Common jurisdiction vs. Water / Admiralty / Commerce jurisdiction:

Example Sentence #1 Land / Common jurisdiction

As one of the "We the People" a free man, I travel, in private, upon the roadways, in my automobile or carriage or by any other means that I determine expedient, in safety and without molestation, while being secure in my property and my papers, using only my passport, as my protection and my identification, as is my right of locomotion. I am lawful.

vs

Example Sentence #2 Water / Admiralty / Commerce jurisdiction

As a person, a entity, a citizen, a resident, through privilege of contract with government, I drive or operate my motor vehicle upon the highways when in possession of a drivers license, I am operating in commerce if I am following all rules, codes, statutes, ordinances, (which are all corporate by-laws) I am legal. *

*(Only applies when hauling Passengers for hire, or goods for resale in interstate commerce or for public servants in the performance of their official duties)

Sentences above are examples of two distinct jurisdictions of land and water!


Man has dominion, man has jurisdiction over all things.

All Law is but merely, land, Air, or Water.

According to Genesis 1:26-28 in The Holy Bible, "[I] God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion.... So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."

According to Genesis 1:26-28 in The Holy Bible, God bestows man with dominion and jurisdiction over all things—but NOT over other man.

The Bar Association routinely, incorrectly or purposely, exchanges the word "venue" and other words, replacing them with the word "jurisdiction" to confuse the people, the State Nationals, and the citizens.



Ephesians 6:12 KJV

For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.

Governments have no jurisdiction over man. Governments have jurisdiction only over artificial entities and Over its own employees.

"Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the MIND ONLY with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible. The legal manifestation of this is that NO government, as well as any law agency, aspect, court, etc., can concern itself with anything other than Corporate, Artificial Persons and the Contracts between them." (emphasis added). S.C.R. 1795, *Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators* 3 U.S. 54; 1 L.Ed 57; 3 Dall. 54, Supreme Court of the United States 1795, [Not the "United States Supreme Court" -ed.]

"No sanction can be imposed absent proof of jurisdiction"

Stanard v. Olesen, 74 S. Ct.768

"Once challenged, jurisdiction cannot be 'assumed', it must be proved to exist."

Stuck v. Medical Examiners, 94 Ca2d 751.211 P2s 389

"Jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be TIMELY PROVEN, AND EMPHASITICALLY DECIDED. " *Maine v. Thiboutot*, 100 S. Ct. 2502

"The law requires proof of jurisdiction to appear on the record of the administrative agency and all administrative proceedings." *Hagans v. Lavine*, 415 U.S. 533

If any tribunal finds absence of proof of jurisdiction over person and subject matter, the case must be dismissed."

Louisville R.R. v. Motley, 211 U.S. 149, 29 S. Ct. 42

Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12b 6, the prosecution has failed to provide adequate proof that the parties involved in this situation are actually corporate entities. There is ample proof that the prosecution and other agents are actually corporations.

Title 28 USC 3002 Section 15A states United States is a Federal Corporation and not a government, including the Judicial Procedural Section.

In numerous cases, SCOTUS has said in summary:

- 1) that since governments chose to incorporate themselves, they must abide by the same rules as any other corporations.**
- 2) that governments are now de facto, as corporations; and that they pass no laws, but only corporate bylaws called rules, codes, statutes, executive orders, ordinances and policies.**
- 3) that all rules, codes, statutes, executive orders, ordinances and policies, are “colored/colorable” and governed only by the consent of the governed and through the fraudulent creation and unlawful conversion of man-kind into a legal Person, Citizen, Resident. Obtained through TACIT Agreement and not honorable contract.**

A court has no jurisdiction to determine its own jurisdiction, for a basic issue in any case before a tribunal is its power to act, and a court must have the authority to decide that question the first instance.” Rescue Army v. Municipal Court of Los Angeles, 171 P2d 8: 331 US 549, 91 K, ed, 1666m 67 S, Ct, 1409

I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, a living soul, a woman, do not consent to this type of fraud. I am governed by my GOD, his beloved Son, Jesus Christ, the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and the dictates of my own conscience.

As Clearly stated herein as a Latter Day Saint, my faith and beliefs are clear;

Doctrine & Covenant 98

A long established Published Document, Obeyed by Millions... Therefore Law.

4 And now, verily I say unto you concerning **the laws of the land**, it is my will that my people should observe to do all things whatsoever I command them. 5 And that **law of the land** which is **constitutional**, supporting that **principle of freedom in maintaining rights and privileges**, belongs to **all mankind**, and is justifiable before me.

6 Therefore, **I, the Lord**, justify you, and your brethren of my church, **in befriending that law which is the constitutional law of the land**; 7 **And as pertaining to law of man, whatsoever is more or less than this, cometh of evil.**

8 **I, the Lord God, make you free, therefore ye are free indeed; and the law also maketh you free.**

9 Nevertheless, when the wicked rule the people mourn.

10 Wherefore, honest men and wise men should be sought for diligently, and good men and wise men ye should observe to uphold; otherwise whatsoever is less than these cometh of evil.

11 And I give unto you a commandment, that ye shall forsake all evil and cleave unto all good, that ye shall live by every word which proceedeth forth out of the mouth of God.

12 For he will give unto the faithful line upon line, precept upon precept; and I will try you and prove you herewith.

The constitution clearly states that only congress can pass laws, yet since incorporated every act of congress has a line in it that reads, "this act shall not effect any rights thus previously established".

This means congress cannot pass any ex-post facto laws.

WHAT DO YOU THINK THE LAW IS?

16 Am Jur 2d, Sec 177 late 2d, Sec 256:

The general misconception is that any statute passed by legislators bearing the appearance of law constitutes the law of the land. The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and any statute, to be valid, must be in agreement. It is impossible for both the Constitution and a law violating it to be valid; one must prevail. This is succinctly stated as follows:

The General rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law is in reality no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for any purpose; since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it. An unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is as inoperative as if it had never been passed.

Such a statute leaves the question that it purports to settle just as it would be had the statute not been enacted. Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no rights, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection, and justifies no acts performed under it.....

A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing valid law. Indeed, insofar as a statute

runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it.

It exposes, that private BAR attorneys have been indoctrinated into believing that we have a lawful system of justice, which we do not. Their job today is to prevent the American people from understanding our reality and to keep us all locked into the legal system BAR attorneys created and were trained to implement. Our current 'legal system' is a fraud and it works to their benefit and to our detriment. This truth was confirmed by Karen Hudes, former World Bank Attorney, during an interview. "Former World Bank Attorney exposes the bankers and the BAR"

Ms Hudes correctly stated that:

"I don't want to believe that all of these lawyers and the American Bar Association are pulling a fast one on everybody like this, but I have no choice – that's the way it is. If that's the way it is, I'd rather admit that's the way it is than sit there being a dupe."

She goes on to say that...

"the ABA [American Bar Association] has lost all total credibility and they should apologize to the American people for what it is they have been doing. And they should disband!"

Ms. Hudes further explains what has happened to our legal system during an interview titled: "Information on the 13th Amendment" that Ms. Hudes referred to: "The Missing 13th Amendment".

Both our government and our courts are playing Chess, while telling the people the game is Checkers. If We the People wish to restore our unalienable birth rights, we need to learn to play Chess.

FRAUD

The thing about fraud is this: At some point in time, it must be recognized, learned, and vitiated. Only then is justice obtained. Only then is Liberty achieved.

Please let me explain the Claim above so you may rule any and all contracts pertaining to this matter and any previous matters of the court pertaining to this man Void Ab Initio.

The Living story of the Fraud of the Cestui Que Vie Act of 1 666

My Mother, a woman, a living soul, created by God, of flesh and blood, very much alive; went into the "foundling" (a safe place to abandon a child) hospital believing she would get care but instead was falsely declared indigent, a pauper.

Then... Having recently undergone the extreme duress of a major medical trauma commonly known as childbirth, and under the influence of painkillers, being anxious to go home to her comfortable bed, in order to pursue a happy life with her beautiful, newly born baby.

She unknowingly filled out some dubious and unexplained forms put before her. By the presumptive Tacit agreement of government she was coerced into signing them as an "informant", (one who gives someone up to another), and as a citizen, as a person, as a resident by historical definitions of a "city employee", a

"dead legal entity or office of person", and "as someone there temporarily to do business".

And... My innocent mother thus failing to recognize the lifelong consequences of her actions as there was no "Full and Honest Disclosure" nor any "Meeting of the Minds" which surely Vitiates any contract.

This form that my mother signed was fraudulently used to create a document of title, a Bond, a Insured Security, and was then sent to the Department of Human Resources registered as human capital, Slavery jointly by the foundling Hospital and by the STATE.

This Action created a Copyright infringement and Unlawful Conversion of given Christian born Name converted to birthed NAMES and bonded, their attached CUSIP #'s attached to the CESTUI QUE VIE trust, all "look alike sound a like" names, a constructive fraud.

It was a fraud created by powerful and corrupt groups of controlling men.

Since JESSICA WREN MANN AS SHOWN ON BIRTH RECORD B102-72-024570 Was Fraudulently created by STATE OF ARIZONA, with its creation (berthed) date as recorded on the 29TH, Day of AUGUST, 1972 as Instrument File No. 13286, of Official Records of MARICOPA COUNTY, Department of Human Resources of the STATE OF ARIZONA. With its Own unique CUSIP ##redacted##. is also Dead. STATE OF ARIZONA has no remedy available to its Fictionally Dead Entity.

While I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, Born alive on the different date of 29th, day of August 1972 at 9:56 p.m. upon the Land Jurisdiction known as Arizona, a

De Jure republic, was, as its signatory officer, (person) without "full and honest disclosure" of what that meant, was a minor at the time and not a valid party to the contract.

As mentioned above, at some point in time one recognizes the fraud as the man, the living soul, this child of god, has done and has awoke to the fact that it is his blood, sweat, and the tears and pains of his labor, the man's, that has been fraudulently held as the surety and the debtor when he is truly the holder in due coarse and the actual creditor...

But No, he is deemed "LOST AT SEA" by his very co-trustee of his own (E)state while his employees (Government Corporations) steals from the fruits of his labor.

Then through this fraud tried to make the Man, the living soul, a signatory officer (into a "PERSON") a fraudulently created dead dog Latin entity, an unknowing party to the Bankrupt Corporation the UNITED STATES and STATE of ARIZONA subsidiary, all just more constructive fraud.

I ask you this; Is the Man and Living soul an Executor to, a Beneficiary of, or in any other way, is he one who enjoys any financial benefit to this Cestui Que Vie Trust estate?

Or, does one have to call in a federal bankruptcy judge to dissolve the Cestui Que Vie Trust and settle and claim the estate / the minor account?

Or, does one just claim it by asking the administrator, as the law states?

These private secret trusts are set up under Canonum De Ius Positivum Canons of Positive Law....

Canon 2048

Since 1933, when a child is borne in a State (Estate) under inferior Roman law, three (3) Cestui Que (Vie) Trusts are created upon certain presumptions, specifically designed to deny the child forever any rights of Real Property, any Rights as a Free Person and any Rights to be known as man and woman rather than a creature or animal, by claiming and possessing their Soul or Spirit.

Canon 2049

Since 1933, upon a new child being borne, the Executors or Administrators of the higher Estate willingly and knowingly convey the beneficial entitlements of the child as Beneficiary into the 1st Cestui Que(Vie) Trust in the form of a Registry Number by registering the Name, thereby also creating the Corporate Person and denying the child any rights as an owner of Real Property.

Canon 2050

Since 1933, when a child is borne, the Executors or Administrators of the higher Estate knowingly and willingly claim the baby as chattel to the Estate. The slave baby contract is then created by honoring the ancient tradition of either having the ink impression of the feet of the baby onto the live birth record, or a drop of its blood as well as tricking the parents to signing the baby away through the deceitful legal meanings on the live birth record. This live birth record as a promissory note is converted into a slave bond sold to the private reserve bank of the estate and then conveyed into a 2nd and separate Cestui Que (Vie) Trust

per child owned by the bank. Upon the promissory note reaching maturity and the bank being unable to "seize" the slave child, a maritime lien is lawfully issued to "salvage" the lost property and itself monetized as currency issued in series against the Cestui Que (Vie) Trust.

Canon 2051

Each Cestui Que Vie Trust created since 1933 represents one of the 3 Crowns representing the 3 claims of property of the Roman Cult, being Real Property, Personal Property and Ecclesiastical Property and the denial of any rights to men and women, other than those chosen as loyal members of the society and as Executors and Administrators.

Canon 2052

The Three (3) Cestui Que Vie Trusts are the specific denial of rights of Real Property, Personal Property and Ecclesiastical Property for most men and women, corresponds exactly to the three forms of law available to the Galla of the Bar Association Courts. The first form of law is corporate commercial law is effective because of the 1st Cestui Que Vie Trust. The second form of law is maritime and trust law is effective because of the 2nd Cestui Que Vie Trust. The 3rd form of law is Talmudic and Roman Cult law is effective because of the 3rd Cestui Que Vie Trust of Baptism.

Canon 2053

The Birth Certificate issued under Roman Law represents the modern equivalent to the Settlement Certificates of the 17th century and signifies the holder as a pauper and effectively a Roman Slave. The Birth Certificate has no direct relationship to the private secret trusts controlled by the private banking

network, nor can it be used to force the administration of a state or nation to divulge the existence of these secret trusts.

Canon 2054

As the Cestui Que Vie Trusts are created as private secret trusts on multiple presumptions including the ongoing bankruptcy of certain national estates, they remain the claimed private property of the Roman Cult banks and therefore cannot be directly claimed or used.

Canon 2055

While the private secret trusts of the private central banks cannot be directly addressed, they are still formed on certain presumptions of law including claimed ownership of the name, the body, the mind and soul of infants, men and women. **Each and every man and woman has the absolute right to rebuke and reject such false presumptions as the holder of their own title.**

Canon 2056

Given the private secret trusts of the private central banks are created on false presumptions, when a man or woman makes clear their Live Borne Record and claim over their own name, body, mind and soul, any such trust based on such false presumptions ceases to have any property.

Canon 2057

Any Administrator or Executor that refuses to immediately dissolve a Cestui Que (Vie) Trust, upon a Person establishing their status and competency, is guilty of fraud and fundamental breach of their fiduciary duties requiring their immediate removal and punishment..

Canon 2124

When a person has re-established their competent living status, then by law the Cestui Que (Vie) Trust is dissolved and they return to being acknowledged as a beneficiary or a some higher standing if a trust. In either case, it is both unlawful and a serious fraud against the law to seek Income Taxes once the Cestui Que Vie is dissolved and no (dead) body corporate exists to use as argument for rent.

Canon 2127

When a person has re-established their competent living status, then no Cestui Que (Vie) Trust may exist in their place. Therefore, a Company must be formed as a Trust instead of a Cestui Que Vie and company tax cannot be charged for rent under its present form.

QUESTION FOR THE PROSECUTION:

IS IT TRULY YOUR HONEST INTENTION TO DEFRAUD ME OR INJURE ME IN ANY WAY OR IS IT YOUR INTENT TO CONSPIRE OR DENY ME ANY BASIC GOD-GIVEN, GUARANTEED CONSTITUTIONAL and INTERNATIONAL RIGHTS, HERE?

Wherefore, here now comes my Living Testimony:

My Living Testimony, in the form of and part of this Affidavit shall be truth in fact upon the record. It is presented to the best of my knowledge and belief, and is sworn under oath and the penalty of perjury. It is un-rebutted, precept by precept, and shall become judgment upon the record.

1) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, a living soul, a woman of GOD, Sui Juris, having only just recently learned of the fraud committed by the courts, the BAR Association, and those of perceived authority claiming to represent this De Facto Government, A foreign Corporation, calling itself the UNITED STATES. Its subsidiary corporation the STATE OF ARIZONA. Who having created a false fictional entity known as, JESSICA WREN MANN, that it is this, fictional Entity being charged as such.

NOM DE GUERRE, PERSONATE false person name is a breach of the supreme law treaty of the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights, Part 1, Amendments 1-27. It is in breach of U.S.C. Title 18: §1342: [Point 1 A - d] the use of Fiction names against living-souls is a breach of U.S.C Title 18 §1341 [Point 1 A - e] to cause a Fraud and Swindle. For the defendant(s) by showing their true identity in upper and lowercase lettering with punctuation, the court is in breach of F.R.C.P. RULE:10(a): [Point 1 A - f] using the proper name of the Party, and a breach of F.R.C.P. RULE: 17, [Point 1 A - g] only the real party of concern can be sued in the admiralty.

2) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, hereby Demand a Dismissal with extreme prejudice, as I am NOT, nor have I ever been that fictional Entity called as JESSICA WREN MANN AS SHOWN ON BIRTH RECORD B102-72-024570, which was created by you, the UNITED STATES, the STATE of ARIZONA and Not I, and that was further perpetrated through fraud upon my Mother, and upon myself at my Birth.

See Birth Certificate or Certificate of Live Birth

3) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, state for the record, that I am of sound Mind and Body and having good Mental Faculties, I hereby state that I Believe that I, a living soul, exist upon the LAND Jurisdiction given to all

Mankind by GOD, as stated in Genesis, and NOT of any other jurisdiction of the AIR, or WATER. (LAW = Land, Air, Water). As such I have Mailed my "Affidavit of Repudiation of Citizenship" to the President, State Department, Department of Justice, and recorded my Names upon the Land through a Deed of Re-Conveyance along with my Patent of Nativity in the county of my Birth.

I Believe that I Served Notice to "the powers that be" that I am alive and that I claim the Cestui Que Vie BIRTH CERTIFICATE TRUST account, (Title 31 U.S. Code 1321/1322), is what we are supposed to do. - Nationality Act, 1940.

- 4) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, State for the record that I am a State National, Foreign to the De Facto UNITED STATES Corporation. Its foreign agents must register under the 1938 Foreign Agent Registration Act which is Constitution law from Federal Immigration and Original Constitution Nationality Act Section 8 USC 1324(a)(1)(A)(iv)(b)(iii). the Americans living in these states are NOT "domestic" with respect to the "United States" ---- UCC 9 (307) h states the following "The location of the United States: the United States is located in the District of Columbia...." I have also filed An "affidavit of repudiation of citizenship" to the secretary of state of the UNITED STATES, to the president of the UNITED STATES, and to the attorney general of the UNITED STATES, and to the Attorney General of the STATE OF ARIZONA. I have also recorded upon the land of the county of Cache my "Patent of Nativity" Showing that my ancestors my very DNA lived upon the land before this government even existed.

5) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, State I, am also a ambassador servant of Christ. According to Public Law 97-280 whereby Congress declared the Bible the word of God, that puts the laws of The Creator on effect.

6) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, do hereby declare that I do NOT Consent to any Presumptions or Assumptions or Hearsay on your part but only on Truth and Facts.

Every State law must conform in the first place to the Constitution of the United States, and then to the subordinate constitutions of the particular state; and if it infringes upon the provisions of either, it is so far void." Houston v. Moore, 18 US 1, 5 L.Ed 19 (1840). It is abiding truth that "nothing can destroy a government more quickly than its failure to observe its own laws, or worse, its disregard of the charter of its own existence." Mapp v. Ohio, 367 U.S. 643, 659 (1961). HARRIS V. NEW YORK U.S. Supreme Court 401 U.S. 222 (1971). The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a natural individual entitled to relief is entitled to free access to its judicial tribunals and public offices in every State in the Union (2 Black 620, see also Crandell v. Nevada, 6 Wall 35. Plaintiff should not be charged fees, or costs for the lawful and constitutional right to petition this court in this matter in which he is entitled to relief, as it appears that the filing fee rule was originally implemented for fictions and subjects of the State and should not be applied to the Plaintiff who is a natural individual and entitled to relief. Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43] HALE v. HENKEL 201 U.S. 43 at 89 (1906) Hale v. Henkel was decided by the united States Supreme Court in 1906. The opinion of the court states: "The "individual" may stand upon "his Constitutional Rights" as a CITIZEN. He is entitled to carry on his "private" business in his own way. "His power to contract is unlimited." He owes no

duty to the State or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate him. He owes no duty to the State, since he receives nothing there from, beyond the protection of his life and property. "His rights" are such as "existed" by the Law of the Land (Common Law) "long antecedent" to the organization of the State", and can only be taken from him by "due process of law", and "in accordance with the Constitution." "He owes nothing" to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights. " HALE V. HENKEL 201 U.S. 43 at 89 (1906) Hale v. Henkel is binding on all the courts of the United States of America until another Supreme Court case says it isn't. No other Supreme Court case has ever overturned Hale v. Henkel None of the various issues of Hale v. Henkel has ever been overruled since 1906, Hale v. Henkel has been cited by the Federal and State Appellate Court systems over 1,600 times! In nearly every instance when a case is cited, it has an impact on precedent authority of the cited case. Compared with other previously decided Supreme Court cases, no other case has surpassed Hale v. Henkel in the number of times it has been cited by the courts. "The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government."

- 7) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman do hereby declare as a woman, living soul, that I am Sui Juris and demand that I, be recognized as such.
 "Merely being native born within the territorial boundaries of the United States of America does not make such an inhabitant, a Citizen of the United States subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment."
 Elk v. Wilkins, Neb, 5s.ct.41,112 U.S. 99, 28 L. Ed. 643

8) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, declare I am NOT Pro Se. That I am as stated Sui Juris, that I am not here in any representative position. Except as a woman. I do NOT wish to have an attorney or public pretender, they are the very reason I'm here now in this position. I do NOT Consent.

Affiant has no record or evidence that if Affiant fires any attorney it should ever be questioned, as per; Barr v Day, 124 Wn. 2d 318, at 328 (1994) "Attorney when fired, is fired without question." "It is a clearly established principle of law that an attorney must represent a corporation, it being incorporeal and a creature of the law. An attorney representing an artificial entity must appear with the corporate charter and law in his hand. A person acting as an attorney for a foreign principal must be registered to act on the principal's behalf." See, Foreign Agents Registration Act" (22 USC § 612 et seq.); Victor Rabinowitz et. at. v. Robert F. Kennedy, 376 US 605. "Failure to file the "Foreign Agents Registrations Statement" goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of standing to be before the court, and is a felony pursuant to 18 USC §§ 219, 951. The conflict of law, interest and allegiance is obvious. A Lawyer can not make a claim to your rights , Only you can. Federal District Court Judge James Alger Fee's mind blowing assertion in United States v. Johnson, 76 F. Supp. 538 (M.D. Pa. 1947)

9) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, I, am NOT a "PERSON". I am NOT, a "US CITIZEN". I, am NOT an EMPLOYEE of the STATE, UNITED STATES, UNITED NATIONS, or the DISTRICT of COLUMBIA, and therefore I am NOT subject to its rules, codes, and statutes. I, do NOT Consent and I, do NOT Pledge my Allegiance to any other, than my GOD, for it is by his Grace alone, that I, shall live. "Since in common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, statutes employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it." U.S. v. General Motors Corporation, D.C. Ill, 2 F.R.D. 528,

530: In "common usage the word 'person' does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing the word are generally construed to exclude the sovereign." *Church of Scientology v. US Department of Justice*, 612 F.2d 417 @425 (1979): "the word 'person' in legal terminology is perceived as a general word which normally includes in its scope a variety of entities other than human beings., see e.g. 1, U.S.C. § para 1." In the 1935 Supreme Court case of *Perry v. US* (294 US 330) the Supreme Court found that: "In United States, sovereignty resides in people... the Congress cannot invoke the sovereign power of the People to override their will as thus declared.",

10) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, declare I, am NOT a Resident of the District of Columbia or any "districts" so claimed by "The Corporation" and/or any of its Zip Codes calling itself the "UNITED STATES" or any Appellation thereof. I do NOT consent.

Every State law must conform in the first place to the Constitution of the United States, and then to the subordinate constitutions of the particular state; and if it infringes upon the provisions of either, it is so far void." *Houston v. Moore*, 18 US 1, 5 L.Ed 19 (1840). It is abiding truth that "nothing can destroy a government more quickly than its failure to observe its own laws, or worse, its disregard of the charter of its own existence." *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643, 659 (1961). *HARRIS V. NEW YORK U.S.* Supreme Court 401 U.S. 222 (1971). The federal Constitution makes a careful distinction between natural born Citizens and citizens of the United States** (compare 2:1:5 with Section 1 of the so-called 14th Amendment). One is an unconditional Sovereign by natural birth, who is endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights; the other has been granted the revocable privileges of U.S.** citizenship, endowed by the Congress of the

United States**. One is a Citizen, the other is a subject. One is a Sovereign, the other is a subordinate. One is a Citizen of our constitutional Republic; the other is a citizen of a legislative democracy (the federal zone). Notice the superior/subordinate relationship between these two statuses.

11) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, having recently learned of the fraud, do state for the record that "THERE IS NO CONTRACT" with the "UNITED STATES", "STATE OF ARIZONA", "ANY COURT", "JUDGE", "ATTORNEY", "ADMINISTRATOR", "AGENT" or "POLITICIAN" thereof. That I am rescinding all signatures. That there has never been present the 8 elements of a contract or any Full and Honest disclosure. Nor was there ever a time where I was not under threat and duress. Neither was there, both I, and another(s) wet ink signatures on any such document(s). I, do NOT Consent.

See Below 8 Elements of a contract

1. Parties competent to contract

The parties to a contract should be competent, being of the age of consent, of sound mind, not disqualified from contracting by any law to which s/ he is subject. A flaw in capacity may be due to minority, lunacy, idiocy, drunkenness, or dissimilarity of kind. The parties should be of the same kind, being either legal fiction actors, or natural living men/women, allowing more than two parties, but never a mixture of these kinds and their respective jurisdictions.

2. Free and genuine consent

The consent of the parties to the agreement must be free and genuine. The consent of the parties should not be obtained by misrepresentation, fraud, undue

influence, coercion or mistake. If the consent is obtained by any of these means, then the contract is not valid or legally/lawfully enforceable.

3. Full disclosure

When negotiating a contract, full disclosure is the step of providing all material information, or telling the "whole truth", about any matter which may influence the decision-making of the other party or parties before they decide to enter into a contract. If either party fails to make full disclosure, the contract is null and void.

4. Valuable consideration

The consideration is something of value possessed by the parties that is brought to the contract table. This something of value is bargained for and given in exchange for a promise or a performance. The parties must each receive a benefit and each suffer a detriment. To be enforceable, a contract must have valuable consideration. A contract is unenforceable if it has insufficient or unequal consideration without agreement.

5. Certainty of terms

The Terms and Conditions of the contract must be fully disclosed and agreed upon, and must be certain and fixed. Any subsequent variation of terms must be agreed.

6. Meeting of the minds

A meeting of the minds “consensus ad idem”, occurs between the parties when they recognize each other, understand their mutual obligations, and agree. A meeting of the minds occurs between living men/women in lawful matters (Common Law jurisdiction), and between legal fiction actors in legal matters (Admiralty Maritime jurisdiction). A contract must be either Lawful or Legal. If one party to a contract makes a “signature” as an “accommodation party” to a legal fiction person, while the other party makes an “autograph” for a living man or woman, the parties are of unequal kinds, and the contract is null & void.

7. Autographs or Signatures

Lawful written contracts between living men/women must carry the wet ink autographs of the parties, comprising living identification such as a thumbprint, but more often living standing is recognized by an unambiguous declaration with the handwritten wet ink autograph, including the prefix “By:”, and/or the words “All Rights Reserved,” and “Without Prejudice,” written below. Legal written contracts between legal fiction actors must carry the wet ink signatures of the parties, as an accommodation from a man/woman.

8. Privity of contract

A contract exists only between the parties. No third-party can obtain rights contained within a contract, or buy or sell a contract, without the express permission of the original parties.

12) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, shall only file NOTICES and AFFIDAVITS or DEMANDS and CLAIMS. If an AFFIDAVIT is not challenged within 21 days “point by point” it is FACT and shall be on the record as truth and it then shall become the judgement upon the record.

Morris v National Cash Register, 44 S.W. 2D 433, clearly states at point #4

that "uncontested allegations in affidavit must be accepted as true.", and the Federal case of *Group v Finletter*, 108 F. Supp. 327 states, "Allegations in affidavit in support of motion must be considered as true in absence of counter-affidavit."

13) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, Claim that no crime by me exists as i have not knowingly or willfully injured another soul. There was nor never has been any **Intent** to harm.

"A 'Statute' is not a Law," (Flournoy v. First Nat. Bank of Shreveport, 197 La. 1067, 3 So.2d 244, 248),]

A "Code' is not a Law," (In Re Self v Rhay Wn 2d 261), in point of fact in Law, A concurrent or 'joint resolution' of legislature is not "Law," (Koenig v. Flynn, 258 N.Y. 292, 179 N. E. 705, 707; Ward v State, 176 Okl. 368, 56 P.2d 136, 137; State ex rel. Todd v. Yelle, 7 Wash.2d 443, 110 P.2d 162, 165).

All codes, rules, and regulations are for government authorities only, not Living Souls / Creators in accord with God's Laws.

"All codes, rules, and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking due process of Law. "(Rodriques v. Ray Donavan, U.S. Department of Labor, 769 F.2d 1344, 1348 (1985))

"All laws, rules and practices which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void" [Marbury v. Madison, 5th US (2 Cranch) 137, 180] Therefore if the woman/man Calling herself/himself as so named above as "STATE OF ARIZONA" or "UNITED STATES" shall come forward in her/his own flesh body showing acceptable identification, can point me out across the room identifying I, as having done him/her some injury, I, shall make amends giving fair and just compensation to discharge this matter. An impossibility! I believe Mr.

Prosecutor is bringing false charges on behalf of his imaginary friend. "For a crime to exist, there must be an injured party. There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of Constitutional rights."- Sherar v. Cullen, 481 F. 945.

14) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, instruct you to discharge this entire matter, with extreme prejudice and award the penalties for the crimes to be paid to me in compensation and damages for bringing false charges and arrest against my soul. Plus a charge of \$1. / per Minute or \$1,440. / per day, from date of first indictment to date of my dismissal and release. Take Notice! This is my fee schedule. You have ordered off my freedom menu. There is a cost.

15) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, Demand after dismissal and release that all information of myself and any fictional entity fraudulently created in my similar name, be removed/stricken from the record, including all physical and intellectual property linking me to same.

Canon 2057 - Any Administrator or Executor that refuses to immediately dissolve a Cestui Que (Vie) Trust, upon a Person establishing their status and competency, is guilty of fraud and fundamental breach of their fiduciary duties requiring their immediate removal and punishment. 50 USC 4305 B (2) "Any payment, conveyance, transfer, assignment, or delivery of property or interest therein, made to or for the account of the United States, or as otherwise directed, pursuant to this subdivision or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder shall to the extent thereof be a full acquittance and discharge for all purposes of the obligation of the person making the same; and no person shall be held liable in any court for or in respect to anything done or omitted in good faith in connection with the

administration of, or in pursuance of and in reliance on, this subdivision, or any rule, regulation, instruction, or direction issued hereunder." (formerly 12 USC 95 (A) (2)

16) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, Demand that if you do not dismiss with extreme prejudice, that you provide me with a copy of the IRS form 1120, The judges Oath of Office and Both Public servant Bonds, and copy of all Agents registrations as Foreign Agents, for my review and for my appeal. Recently, a criminal complaint and petition was filed in the District Court of New Jersey, Trenton Division accusing District Court Judge Freda L Wolfson of obstruction of justice and requesting the release of a federal prisoner, based on the contention that the judge had no authority to sentence anyone to jail.

"Judges are presumed to know the law or where to find it."

In prepared remarks by Attorney General Jeff Sessions on September 5, 2017, Sessions stated: "As the Attorney General, it is my duty to ensure that the laws of the United States are enforced and that the Constitutional order is upheld. No greater good can be done for the overall health and well-being of our Republic, than preserving and strengthening the impartial rule of law. Societies where the rule of law is treasured are societies that tend to flourish and succeed."

The petitioner, David Moleski, a former chiropractor and pilot from Neptune, New Jersey, claims he was falsely imprisoned when the judge in his criminal trial on mail fraud and wire fraud charges, sentenced him to 54 months in prison, followed by five years of supervised release, as well as a \$10,000 fine and more than \$48,000 in restitution. Because of the false imprisonment, Moleski's lawyers requested the immediate release of their client.

The argument presented in the complaint suggests that Judge Wolfson obstructed justice pursuant to 18 USC § 1512, et. seq., because she knew in advance that she had no authority to “prosecute, adjudge, or imprison” Moleski. Attorneys for Moleski and other social justice groups thoroughly researched the issue and found that the law granting District Court Judges the authorization to send any defendants in any criminal case to prison is invalid because the bill that passed the house in 1947 did not match the one that passed the Senate in 1948. If Public Law 80-772 is indeed not valid, then Moleski and presumably thousands of other prisoners, were sent to prison illegally.

This is a very serious issue because it would mean that no federal judge currently has authorization to sentence anyone accused of a federal crime to prison; it would call into question any criminal case in which a person convicted of a federal crime was sentenced to incarceration.

President Truman “signed” Public Law 80-772 into law on June 25, 1948. Thus ostensibly rewrote Title 18 of the United States Code. However a different bill passed the House in 1947 than passed the Senate in 1948, rendering that law unconstitutional.

Until the Senate and the House pass the EXACT SAME BILL and the bill is signed by the President or the bill is not signed and becomes law without signature because BOTH houses passed the bill, there is no law. Just because the House of Representatives voted to pass a law does not make it an enforceable law without passage from the Senate as well.

So all you had is a bill passed by the House in 1947 and a different one passed by the Senate in 1948 and then they have to get together and negotiate

a combined or compromised law for passage of both houses before it can become law or the law dies. See Article I, Section 7 of the Constitution. Title 18 also includes 18 U.S.C. § 4081 and 18 U.S.C. § 4082, which authorizes the transfer of a federal criminal judgment from the U.S. District Court to the Department of Justice and then from the Department of Justice to the Bureau of Prisons. However, 18 USC 4081 and 4082 are not in the Statutes at Large, and do not exist as a matter of law. No transfer of a judgment is possible, rendering any imprisonment impossible.

Researchers looked at numerous memos from House and Senate Clerks, and they all confirmed that the bill that passed the House on May 12, 1947 was different from the one that passed the Senate in June, 1948 and went to Truman's desk. According to the argument in the complaint, P.L. 80-772 positively repealed the previous laws granting jurisdiction to district court judges, which means District Court Judges effectively have no jurisdiction to either classify defendants in the Bureau of Prisons or to hold them at all. In other words, based on their research, even if a judgment was considered valid, judges have no authority to send anyone to prison.

The recent complaint makes the claim that Judge Wolfson's acceptance of indictments and the issuance of orders in Moleski's case are legally void and thus constitute obstruction of justice because 18 U.S.C. § 3231 was never legally passed by Congress and neither 18 U.S.C. § 4081 nor 18 U.S.C. § 4082 are valid sections of the statutes at large. In addition, they claim the denial of the Motion to Dismiss on Sept. 13, 2014 filed by Moleski in Moleski's case is obstruction of justice because both the House and the Senate failed to properly pass the same version of P.L. 80-772. Wolfson is presumed to know that.

This is not entirely a new argument. As early as 2008, the Bureau of

Prisons received a large volume of Requests for Administrative Relief because of the claim that no law currently exists that grants jurisdiction to District Court Judges to transfer those convicted of a crime to prison. In 2008 Harley Lappin, then head of the Bureau of Prisons asked the number 2 person in the Department of Justice to investigate the claims. The Department of Justice advised him that the 18 U.S.C. § 3231 is unconstitutional. Game Over! It has the potential to affect a great many current and former federal and state prisoners, from both the United States and foreign countries.

17) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, giving NOTICE that I, am quite aware of the Bid sf 273, Payment sf274, and Performance Bonds sf275, and the fraud associated therewith. As well as its "Net Retentions", paid to judges and prosecutors, And, that the good people are learning of this fraud as well. "DOJ is By far the largest contributor to the Federal Budget by far". Department of Fiscal Services. "Citizens are human capital" (Executive Order 13037) I am aware the Court is a for profit business, A bank, that judges are bankers, that an indictment is a true bill, that if the bill is unpaid you're charged, that all crimes are commerce, that the administrator is after the bond of the Cestui Que Vie. This is all fraud without full and honest disclosure. As a man I refuse to be held as surety. When I am the creditor. the true holder in due course, I hereby claim my Estate.

18) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, am quite aware that the UNITED STATES is a Foreign Entity, the STATE being a Foreign STATE, the Court being a Foreign Entity, and its Agents being Foreign Agents. This is All a De Facto Government without any such De Jure Jurisdiction over those living souls it did not create. "Once jurisdiction is challenged, the court cannot proceed

when it clearly appears that the court lacks jurisdiction, the court has no authority to reach merits, but, rather, should dismiss the action." Melo v. US, 505 F2d 1026.

"There is no discretion to ignore that lack of jurisdiction." Joyce v. US, 474 F2d 215. "The burden shifts to the court to prove jurisdiction." Rosemond v. Lambert, 469 F2d 416. "Court must prove on the record, all jurisdiction facts related to the jurisdiction asserted." Lantana v. Hopper, 102 F2d 188; Chicago v. New York, 37 F Supp 150. "A universal principle as old as the law is that a proceedings of a court without jurisdiction are a nullity and its judgment therein without effect either on person or property." Norwood v. Renfield, 34 C 329; Ex parte Giambonini, 49 P. 732. "Jurisdiction is fundamental and a judgment rendered by a court that does not have jurisdiction to hear is void ab initio." In Re Application of Wyatt, 300 P. 132; Re Cavitt, 118 P2d 846. "Thus, where a judicial tribunal has no jurisdiction of the subject matter on which it assumes to act, its proceedings are absolutely void in the fullest sense of the term." Dillon v. Dillon, 187 P 27. "A court has no jurisdiction to determine its own jurisdiction, for a basic issue in any case before a tribunal is its power to act, and a court must have the authority to decide that question in the first instance." Rescue Army v. Municipal Court of Los Angeles, 171 P2d 8; 331 US 549, 91 L. ed. 1666, 67 S.Ct. 1409. "A departure by a court from those recognized and established requirements of law, however close apparent adherence to mere form in method of procedure, which has the effect of depriving one of a constitutional right, is an excess of jurisdiction." Wuest v. Wuest, 127 P2d 934, 937. "Where a court failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris." Merritt v. Hunter, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739. "the fact that the petitioner was released on a promise to appear before a

magistrate for an arraignment, that fact is circumstance to be considered in determining whether in first instance there was a probable cause for the arrest." Monroe v. Papa, DC, Ill. 1963, 221 F Supp 685.

19) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, declare that if not promptly discharged, **pursuant to FrCrimP 12(b)(2)(3) to declare the indictment and case void**, ab initio. I will be requiring leave of court and my false imprisonment, so that I may bring forth an actual and proper verifiable CLAIM before the court to address these Crimes and Trespasses against me in the proper venue against those individual souls responsible for these serious crimes. i.e. Trespasses such as, Bringing False Charges, False Imprisonment, Misprison of Felony, Unlawful Conversion, Barratry, Fraud, Unjust Enrichment, Involuntary Servitude/Slavery, Personage, Peonage, Press ganging, Defamation of Character, and others.

Trezevant v City of Tampa, 741 F.2d 336, (11th Cir, 9-6-1984) US Court of Appeal awarded \$65,217.39/hour for false imprisonment.

In, Hafer v. Melo, 502 US 21 (1991) The US Supreme Court ruled that public Officials who cause "Unauthorized Deprivations" lose their Eleventh Amendment Protection and are subject to suit for damages under 42 USC 1983. This Case before the US Court of Appeals is found at 912 Fed 2d 628. The key is negligence: acting in excess or without authority or jurisdiction or failing to act when required to do so. Also read Melo v Hafer, 912 F 2d 628 (1990).Westfall v Erwin, 484 US 292 (1988); Will v Michigan State Police,

491

US 58 (1989); and Mitchum v Foster, 407 US 225 (1972).PL 94-381 and Senate Report 94-204, 28 USC § 2284. "When lawsuits are brought against federal officials, they must be brought against them in their "individual"

capacity not their official capacity. When federal officials perpetrate constitutional torts, they do so ultra vires (beyond the powers) and lose the shield of immunity." Williamson v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 815 F.2d. 369, ACLU Foundation v. Barr, 952 F.2d. 457, 293 U.S. App. DC 101, (CA DC 1991). "It is the duty of all officials whether legislative, judicial, executive, administrative, or ministerial to so perform every official act as not to violate constitutional provisions. "Montgomery v state 55 Fla. 97-45S0.879 a. "Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the tangible.

20) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, Declare that, The words used are the words of the Author, and are plain, concise and commonly recognized English and should not be used or twisted in legalese. I, do NOT Consent. Simple words such as "person" "citizen" "people" "or" "nation" "crime" "charge" "right" "statute" "preferred" "prefer" "constitutor" "creditor" "debtor" "debit" "discharge" "payment" "law" and "United States" do not mean what we think they mean, because we were never taught the legal definitions of the above words. No full and honest disclosure = fraud. For Fraud vitiates all contracts. "Fraud vitiates everything" Boyce v. Grundy, 3 Pet. 210 "Fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents and even judgments." U.S. v. Throckmorton, 98 US 61 "WHEREAS, officials and even judges have no immunity." See, Owen vs. City of Independence, 100 S Ct. 1398; Maine vs. Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502; and Hafer vs. Melo, 502 U.S. 21;

Title 28 USC 3002 Section 15A states United States is a Federal Corporation and not a government, including the Judicial Procedural Section.

21) I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, Declare that Upon my indictment, arrest, being finger printed and DNA swabbed, and to this date below Autographed, that at No Time during this process, have I, been afforded my Rights. In Fact I, have been Terrorized, My Religious rights violated. This being an extreme trespass on my soul. The Prosecuting Attorney merely an actor on a stage with a motive for profit, made numerous false statements, using hearsay evidence, and without any first hand witnesses and making motions to deny me a fair trial. My so called Attorney defender merely another actor on a stage, a man trained in the law, should have known to object to the hearsay and other lies, should have told me about my rights and my status, and what it means to even have him as a representative, he should've explained of the unlawful conversion of my name into a Person or entity, denying me of standing, this was false and placed me in an incompetent position as a man. He should of explained resident and the use of Zip Code and its legal meaning. Just one more reason for the Case to be dismissed immediately, without Prejudice, without Recourse.

"The prosecutor is not a witness; and he should not be permitted to add to the record either by subtle or gross improprieties. Those who have experienced the full thrust of the power of government when leveled against them know that the only protection the citizen has is in the requirement for a fair trial." Donnelly v. Dechristoforo, 1974.SCT. 41709 ¶ 56; 416 U.S. 637 (1974) Mr. Justice Douglas, dissenting.

More fraud continued, was this fully disclosed?

The US Government and its subsidiaries is Bankrupt!

The Bankruptcy of The United States

In the **United States Congressional Record, March 17, 1993 Vol. #33, page H-1303**, Speaker-Senator James Traficant, Jr. (Ohio) addressing the House:

"Mr. Speaker, we are here now in chapter 11. Members of Congress are official trustees presiding over the greatest reorganization of any Bankrupt entity in world history, the U.S. Government. We are setting forth hopefully, a blueprint for our future. There are some who say it is a coroner's report that will lead to our demise."

It is an established fact that the United States Federal Government has been dissolved by the **Emergency Banking Act, March 9, 1933, 48 Stat. 1, Public Law 89-719; declared by President Roosevelt, being bankrupt and insolvent.**

H.J.R. 192, 73rd Congress in session June 5, 1933 - Joint Resolution To Suspend The Gold Standard and Abrogate The Gold Clause dissolved the Sovereign Authority of the United States and the official capacities of all United States Governmental Offices, Officers, and Departments and is further evidence that the United States Federal Government exists today in name only.

The receivers of the United States Bankruptcy are the International Bankers, via the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. **All**

United States Offices, Officials, and Departments are now operating within a de facto status in name only under Emergency War Powers. With the Constitutional Republican form of Government now dissolved, the receivers of the Bankruptcy have adopted a new form of government for the United States. This new form of government is known as a Democracy, being an established Socialist/Communist order under a new governor for America. This act was instituted and established by transferring and/or placing the Office of the Secretary of Treasury to that of the Governor of the International Monetary Fund. Public Law 94-564, page 8, Section H.R. 13955 reads in part: "The U.S. Secretary of Treasury receives no compensation for representing the United States?"

United States Congressional Record May 4, 1992, page H 2891, Senator and Chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Senator Henry Gonzalez (Texas) speaking on "NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL THIEVERY IN HIGH PLACES" said "We are bankrupted. We are insolvent on every level of our national life, whether it is corporate, whether it is just plain you and I out there with the life of debt that we have all piled up, private debt, credit cards and what not or whether it is the government. We are insolvent. How long will it take before that nasty Mega-truth is conveyed?"

United States Congressional Record January 19, 1976, page 240 Marjorie S. Holt (Maryland): "Mr. Speaker, many of us recently received a letter from the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia, inviting members of Congress to participate in a ceremonial signing of "A Declaration of INTERdependence" on January 30 in Congress Hall, adjacent to Independence Hall in Philadelphia.

A number of Members of Congress have been invited to sign this document, lending their prestige to its theme, but I want the record to show my strong opposition to this declaration. **It calls for the surrender of our national sovereignty to international organizations.** It declares that our economy should be regulated by international authorities. It proposes that we enter a **"New World Order"** that would redistribute the wealth created by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this is an obscenity that defiles our Declaration of Independence, signed 240+ years ago in Philadelphia. We fought a great Revolution for independence and individual liberty, but now it is proposed that we participate in a world socialist order. Are we a proud and free people, or are we a carcass to be picked by the jackals of the world, who want to destroy us? When one cuts through the high-flown rhetoric of this "Declaration of INTERdependence," one finds key phrases that tell the story. For example, it states that 'The economy of all nations is a seamless web, and that no one nation can any longer effectively maintain its processes of production and monetary systems without recognizing the necessity for collaborative regulation by international authorities.' How do you like the idea of "international authorities" controlling our production and our monetary system, Mr. Speaker? How could any American dedicated to our national independence and freedom tolerate such an idea? America should never subject her fate to decisions by such an assembly, unless we long for national suicide. Instead, let us have independence and freedom....If we surrender our independence to a "new world order"...,we will be betraying our historic ideals of freedom and self-government.

Freedom and self-government are not outdated. The fathers of our Republic fought a revolution for those ideals, which are as valid today as they ever were.

Let us not betray freedom by embracing slave masters; let us not betray self-government with world government; let us celebrate Jefferson and Madison, not Marx and Lenin?

A dollar is a measure of weight defined by the Coinage Act of 1792 and 1900 which is still in force today. A "dollar" specifies a certain quantity, 24.8 grains of gold, or 371.25 grains of silver. In Black's Law Dictionary, sixth Edition, Dollar: "The money unit employed in the United States of the value of one hundred cents, or of any combination of coins totaling 100 cents?" Cent: "A coin of the United States, the least in value of those now minted. It is the hundredth part of a dollar?"

Gold and silver were such a powerful money during the founding of the United States of America, that the founding fathers declared that only gold or silver coins can be "money" in America. Since gold and silver coinage were heavy and inconvenient for a lot of transactions, they were stored in banks and a claim check was issued as a money substitute. People traded their coupons as money, or "currency." Currency is not money, but a money substitute. Redeemable currency must promise to pay a dollar equivalent in gold or silver money. Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs) make no such promises, and are not "money." A Federal Reserve Note is a debt obligation of the federal United States government, not "money?" The federal United States government and the U.S. Congress were not and have never been authorized by the Constitution for the

united states of America to issue currency of any kind, but only lawful money, - gold and silver coin.

It is essential that we comprehend the distinction between real money and paper money substitute. One cannot get rich by accumulating money substitutes, one can only get deeper into debt. We the People no longer have any "money." Most Americans have not been paid any "money" for a very long time, perhaps not in their entire life. Now do you comprehend why you feel broke? Now, do you understand why you are "bankrupt," along with the rest of the country?

Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs) are unsigned checks written on a closed account. FRNs are an inflatable paper system designed to create debt through inflation (devaluation of currency). When ever there is an increase of the supply of a money substitute in the economy without a corresponding increase in the gold and silver backing, inflation occurs. Inflation is an invisible form of taxation that irresponsible governments inflict on their citizens. The Federal Reserve Bank who controls the supply and movement of FRNs has everybody fooled. They have access to an unlimited supply of FRNs, paying only for the printing costs of what they need. FRNs are nothing more than promissory notes for U.S. Treasury securities (T-Bills) - a promise to pay the debt to the Federal Reserve Bank.

There is a fundamental difference between "paying" and "discharging" a debt. To pay a debt, you must pay with value or substance (i.e. gold, silver, barter or a commodity). With FRNs, you can only discharge a debt. You cannot pay a debt with a debt currency system. You cannot service a debt with a currency that has no backing in value or substance. No contract in Common law is valid unless it involves an exchange of "good & valuable consideration." Un-payable debt

transfers power and control to the sovereign power structure that has no interest in money, law, equity or justice because they have so much wealth already.

Their lust is for power and control. Since the inception of central banking, they have controlled the fates of nations.

The Federal Reserve System is based on the Canon law and the principles of sovereignty protected in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. In fact, the international bankers used a "Canon Law Trust" as their model, adding stock and naming it a "Joint Stock Trust." The U.S. Congress had passed a law making it illegal for any legal "person" to duplicate a "Joint Stock Trust" in 1873. The Federal Reserve Act was legislated post-facto (to 1870), although post-facto laws are strictly forbidden by the Constitution. [1:9:3]

The Federal Reserve System is a sovereign power structure separate and distinct from the federal United States government. The Federal Reserve is a maritime lender, and/or maritime insurance underwriter to the federal United States operating exclusively under Admiralty/Maritime law. The lender or underwriter bears the risks, and the Maritime law compelling specific performance in paying the interest, or premiums are the same. Assets of the debtor can also be hypothecated (to pledge something as a security without taking possession of it.) as security by the lender or underwriter. The Federal Reserve Act stipulated that the interest on the debt was to be paid in gold. There was no stipulation in the Federal Reserve Act for ever paying the principle.

Prior to 1913, most Americans owned clear, allodial title to property, free and clear of any liens or mortgages until the Federal Reserve Act (1913)

"Hypothecated" all property within the federal United States to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, -in which the Trustees (stockholders) held legal title. The U.S. citizen (tenant, franchisee) was registered as a "beneficiary" of the trust via his/her birth certificate. In 1933, the federal United States hypothecated all of the present and future properties, assets and labor of their "subjects," the 14th Amendment U.S. citizen, to the Federal Reserve System.

In return, the Federal Reserve System agreed to extend the federal United States corporation all the credit "money substitute" it needed. Like any other debtor, the federal United States government had to assign collateral and security to their creditors as a condition of the loan. Since the federal United States didn't have any assets, they assigned the private property of their "economic slaves", the U.S. citizens as collateral against the un-payable federal debt. They also pledged the unincorporated federal territories, national parks forests, birth certificates, and nonprofit organizations, as collateral against the federal debt. All has already been transferred as payment to the international bankers.

Unwittingly, America has returned to its pre-American Revolution, feudal roots whereby all land is held by a sovereign and the common people had no rights to hold allodial title to property. Once again, We the People are the tenants and sharecroppers renting our own property from a Sovereign in the guise of the Federal Reserve Bank. We the people have exchanged one master for another.

This has been going on for over eighty years without the "informed knowledge" of the American people, without a voice protesting loud enough. Now it's easy to grasp why America is fundamentally bankrupt. Why don't more people own their properties outright? Why are 90% of Americans mortgaged to the hilt and

have little or no assets after all debts and liabilities have been paid? Why does it feel like you are working harder and harder and getting less and less?

We are reaping what has been sown, and the results of our harvest is a painful bankruptcy, and a foreclosure on American property, precious liberties, and a way of life. Few of our elected representatives in Washington, D.C. have dared to tell the truth. The federal United States is bankrupt. Our children will inherit this un=payable debt, and the tyranny to enforce paying it.

America has become completely bankrupt in world leadership, financial credit and its reputation for courage, vision and human rights. This is an undeclared economic war, bankruptcy, and economic slavery of the most corrupt order!

Wake up America! Take back your Country.

The Federal Reserve: An Astounding Exposure 1934

All of the above was published in the Congressional Record March 17, 1993 Volume #33, Page H-1303 by Senator James Traffickant, Jr. Since the total national debt is larger than the total supply of money substitutes and the personal income tax is used solely to pay only the interest on the national debt, paying off the principle and interest of the national debt is a legal impossibility.

THE LAW DOES NOT PERMIT IMPOSSIBILITIES

PLEASE NOTE: IF A CORPORATION IS BANKRUPT IN LAW IT IS SAID TO BE CIVILLY DEAD AND NOT A REAL PARTY IN INTEREST WHICH HAS ANY RIGHTS TO MAKE CLAIMS OR TO SUE ANYBODY. The STATE OF ARIZONA IS ITS SUBSIDIARY!

IT ALSO MEANS YOU CAN'T BE SUED BY THAT CIVILLY DEAD CORPORATION OR PERSON.

FRAUD

The thing about fraud is that... At some point in time it must be recognized, learned, and vitiated. Only then is justice obtained.

Take a hard long look at the below...

- **British Accreditation Registry**
- **1947 BAR Association treaty**
- **Foreign Agents Registration Act**
- **Office of the attorney general for state in history, was put in place to protect and uphold the interest of the Crown Inc.**

The lawyer (BAR) trade craft at work! Utterly Shameful

In 1950, the 81st Congress investigated the Lawyers Guild and determined that the B.A.R. Association is founded and run by communists under definition. Thus, any elected official that is a member of the B.A.R. will only be loyal to the B.A.R. and not the people.

Lawyer's Secret Oath

"It is a clearly established principle of law that an attorney must represent a corporation, it being incorporeal and a creature of the law. An attorney representing an artificial entity must appear with the corporate charter and law in his hand. A person acting as an attorney for a foreign principal must be registered to act on the principal's behalf." See, Foreign Agents Registration

Act" (22 USC § 612 et seq.); Victor Rabinowitz et. al. v. Robert F. Kennedy,376 US 605. "Failure to file the "Foreign Agents Registrations Statement" goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of standing to be before the court, and is a felony pursuant to 18 USC §§ 219, 951. The conflict of law, interest and allegiance is obvious. A Lawyer can not make a claim to your rights, Only you can. Federal District Court Judge James Alger Fee's mind blowing assertion in *United States v. Johnson*, 76 F. Supp. 538 (M.D. Pa. 1947)

U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania - 76 F. Supp. 538 (M.D. Pa. 1947) February 26, 1947 , Congress cannot by legislation enlarge the federal jurisdiction, and it cannot be enlarged under the treaty making power." Mayor, Alderman and Inhabitants of City of New Orleans v. U.S., 35 U.S. 662, 10 Pet. 662, 9 L.Ed. 573 (1836). And; 18 U.S. Code § 661 - Within special maritime and territorial jurisdiction

Current through Pub. L. 114-38. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.) Whoever, within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, takes and carries away, with intent to steal or purloin, any personal property of another shall be punished as follows:

If the property taken is of a value exceeding \$1,000, or is taken from the person of another, by a fine under this title, or imprisonment for not more than five years, or both; in all other cases, by a fine under this title or by imprisonment not more than one year, or both.

18 U.S. Code § 1341 - Frauds and swindles

Current through Pub. L. 114-38. (See Public Laws for the current Congress.)

Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, loan, exchange, alter, give away, distribute, supply, or furnish or procure for unlawful use any

counterfeit or spurious coin, obligation, security, or other article, or anything represented to be or intimated or held out to be such "COUNTERFEIT" or spurious article..... et seq.

5 CFR 2635.101 - Basic obligation of public service.

§ 2635.101 Basic obligation of public service.

Agents of foreign principals

Any agent of a person described in section 611(b)(2) of this title or an entity described in section 611(b)(3) of this title if the agent has engaged in lobbying activities and has registered under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 [2 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.] in connection with the agent's representation of such person or entity.

(June 8, 1938, ch. 327, § 3, 52 Stat. 632; Aug. 7, 1939, ch. 521, § 2, 53 Stat. 1245; Apr. 29, 1942, ch. 263, § 1, 56 Stat. 254; Pub. L. 87-366, § 2, Oct. 4, 1961, 75 Stat. 784; Pub. L. 89-486, § 3, July 4, 1966, 80 Stat. 246; Pub. L. 104-65, § 9(2), (3), Dec. 19, 1995, 109 Stat. 700; Pub. L. 105-166, § 5, Apr. 6, 1998, 112 Stat. 39.)

All "public servants," officials, Congressmen, politicians, judges, attorneys, law enforcement officers, States and their various agencies, etc., are the express agents of these foreign principals - see Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938; 22 USC 286 et seq, 263A, 185G, 267J, 611(C) (ii) & (iii); Treasury Delegation Order #91 information how to file and education Whereas : " Failure to file the " Foreign Agents Registration Statement " goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of standing to be before the Court and is a FELONY" pursuant to 18 US 219,

951

" Failure to file the " Foreign Agents Registration Statement " goes directly to the jurisdiction and lack of standing to be before the Court and is a FELONY" pursuant to 18 US 219, 951 -

I, ask have you registered as a foreign agent?

The truth is, Juris = law and diction = words

LEGAL NOTICE LETTER

You are being given knowledge

Point 1 A. Affiant has no memorial or evidence that Libellee(s) have not used Fictitious Conveyance of Language against Affiant leading to various connected meshing directives founded, multiplied, quickened and executed as fraud to the conclusion of creating pain and suffering to Affiant.

ADMIT - Libellee(s) confess as being true for the guilt of utilizing as a scheme against Affiant: Fictitious Conveyance of Language to Libellee(s) augmentation of wealth contrary to justice as to lead to Affiants pain and suffering.

NOW ,

EXHIBIT 1 A – TAKE Heed of Fictitious Conveyance of Language

BEHOLD THE EVIDENCE: For with its several points is written in event continuum format to bring clarity to the various Points to contend with that view the fact that one point leads to another and the end event is connected to the beginning event with Points to be "set off" in brackets "[]".

INTRODUCTION:

For as the Attorney for the Plaintiff does work for a Law Firm that is a corporate/fiction to carry out a function through the use of a false conveyance of language is "Deceptive Trade Practices": likened to a behavior that is harmful and does create a victim from "ill-gotten gain" to the treasuries of each corporation being utilized.

For please bear in mind that governments are corporations and legislative court systems are for profit "Also Trades As" corporations with very few safeguards in place to shield the private man. These corporations create fear in the minds of the less fortunate men and women that without knowledge and consciousness yield to an Attorney or a Judge fixed to a corporation that send them into involuntary servitude through the use of false conveyance of language. For as it is mandatory PER 26: C.F.R.: 601.72(a)-1 that organizations (hereafter 'structures') within the government are to publish the nature of the 'structures' and how they are composed. There is no public transparency of the true nature of the 'structures' that are calling for monies, fees, fines, penalties, licensing and or pursuing living souls for redress or punishment.

There is no public transparency that the 'structure' of the court is 'structured' as legislative foreign fiction that is using subjective spin, legal fictions, and the like. For the memorials of the judicial system manipulate job titles to confuse and dominate the measures where there are consequences for a man when he holds manipulated memorials to be of true and in harmony with these false meanings without transparency of the true knowledge to whom he is speaking to and what authority is being exercised by the person he is consigning as to whether the person is behaving in his capacity as a judge, banker, legislator or a Post Master. For when seeking a law dictionary to define a Judge it says: see Banker and when arriving to Banker it says: see Post Master: So a judge is also a banker, legislator and Post Master.

BEGINNING OF POINTS: IN PARSE SYNTAX GRAMMAR

Lack of full transparency combined with the use of verb language (versus truth language, noun language) does cause Libellee(s) to be charged with breaching Title 18 §1001, for their [Point 1 A - a] false statements and Title 18 §1002, for their [Point 1 A - b] false papers against Defendant(s) hereafter the party that opposes a complaint.

The 'structures' of the system, the false statements and false papers that place the Defendant(s) at a legal disability. For the party that opposes a complaint claim our handicapped status of Title: 29: U. S. Codes: 706(8)(a), and claim a breach of

Title 29: U. S. Codes: 701(C)(2): the Policy for the [Point 1 A - c] rights of the handicapped: since the government is legally bound by Title: 42: ch: 126: 12182(2)(A) (iv) to make efforts to eliminate communication barriers that hinder the handicapped of which it did create.

For the Attorney(s) for the Plaintiff and the court do fully capitalize each name and aim to direct the pleadings to the fictional NOM DE GUERRE, PERSONATE false person name is a breach of Title 18: U. S. CODES: §1342: [Point 1 A - d] the use of Fiction names against living-souls is a breach of Title 18 U. S. CODES §1341 [Point 1 A - e] to cause a Fraud and Swindle. For the defendant(s) by showing their true identity in upper and lowercase lettering with punctuation, the court is in breach of F.R.C.P. RULE:10(a): [Point 1 A - f] using the proper name of the Party, and a breach of F.R.C.P. RULE: 17, [Point 1 A - g] only the real party of concern can be sued in the admiralty.

For the logical purpose for a man or woman to knowingly (title 42 § 1986) execute such a deed is to hold a system together to benefit the Plaintiff at the

expense of the Defendant(s) which is a breach of: Title: 42: 1985(3) [Point 1 A - h] Deprivation of our Rights.

For as the Plaintiff's Attorneys and the court are in breach of Title: 18: 1961 [Point 1 A - i] Racketeering-activity, and a breach of Title: 42: 1985(2) [Point 1 A - j] Obstruction of the Justice, causing a breach of Title: 42: CH. 21: 1983 [Point 1 A - k] Personal Injury, and a breach of Title: 42: 1983:

NOTE: 39 [Point 1 A - l] Civil Deprivation of the Rights, and a breach of Title: 42: 1983: NOTE: 319 and NOTE: 337 [Point 1 A - m] Custom & Policy and a breach of Title: 18: 241 [Point 1 A - n] Conspiracy against Rights, causing a breach of Title: 18: 242 [Point 1 A - o] Deprivation of the Rights under Color of Law, and a breach of Title: 18: 872 [Point 1 A - p] Collusion/ Coercion, and a breach of Title: 18: Ch.73:§1512 [Point 1 A - q] criminal Obstruction of the Justice, ending with a breach of Title: 28: §: 1359 [Point 1 A - r] Loss of the Jurisdiction by Collusion, all with a breach of Title: 4: §: 3 [Point 1 A - s] which is to violate the sacred character of our nation's flag.

1942 CLEARFIELD TRUST SUPREME COURT RULING

- (i) "Governments descend to the level of a mere private corporation and take on the character of a mere private citizen" [where private corporate commercial paper Federal Reserve Notes are concerned...."For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as an entity entirely separate from government." *Clearfield Trust Company v. United States*, 318 U.S. 363 (1943); *Bank of United States v. Planters Bank*, 9 Wheaton (22 U.S.) 904, 6 L.Ed. 24 (1824).

(ii) "Governments descend to the Level of a mere private corporation, and take on the characteristics of a mere private citizen...where private corporate commercial paper Federal Reserve Notes and securities checks is concerned. ... For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as entities entirely separate from government." - *Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States* 318 U.S. 363-371 (1942).

This case is critical because it is a 1942 case that was fully settled after the **UNITED STATES CORPORATION COMPANY** filed its "CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION" in the State of Florida (July 15, 1925). And was fully settled **AFTER** the 'corporate government' conformed to the use of currency of the private corporation, the **FEDERAL RESERVE**.

The constitution is the law of the land and there can be no statutes or rule making that would abrogate the constitution. The general principal is: anything that is repugnant to or abrogates the constitution is null and void of law.

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, (1966) "Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation, which would abrogate them."

Marbury v. Madison, 5 US 137, (1803) "The Constitution of these United States is the supreme law of the land. Any law that is repugnant to the Constitution is null and void of law."

"An officer of the court may be held liable in damages to any person injured in consequence of a breach of any of the duties connected with his office...The liability for nonfeasance, misfeasance, and for malfeasance in office is in his

'Individual Capacity' , not his official capacity..." see 70 Am. Jur. 2nd Sec. 50, VII Civil Liability

"When lawsuits are brought against federal officials, they must be brought against them in their "individual" capacity not their official capacity. When federal officials perpetrate constitutional torts, they do so ultra vires (beyond the powers) and lose the shield of immunity." Williamson v. U.S. Department of Agriculture, 815 F.2d. 369, ACLU Foundation v. Barr, 952 F.2d. 457, 293 U.S. App.

DC 101, (CA DC 1991). The same rule applies to state officials.

CLAIM OF TRUTH AND DEMAND FOR REMEDY

Crimes have been committed upon the man of trespass, personage, peonage, unlawful conversion, fraud, barratry, bringing false charges under threats, duress, coercion, involuntary servitude, evidence withheld from the grand jury, denial of evidence, denial of character witnesses, lack of first hand witnesses, inadequate and incompetent counsel who sit quietly rather than object, watching a innocent man railroaded, prosecutor making false statements and never a rebuke, repudiate or refuted, allowing of hearsay testimony, no lawful jury of peers, jury tampering by instruction, these and many more crimes at the minimum have been taking place. Railroaded by conspired parties sworn to the same oath without moral regard to lady justice or compassion.

All hearsay testimony done without sworn affidavits nor under any sworn oath of testimony of a first hand witnesses (two co-berating) who is having first hand knowledge, against me. All others are now hereby rebutted by me as hearsay. For this injustice I now seek relief and remedy.

Federal courts Purchase these case convictions from the lower courts, and Federal Judges and prosecutors receive “net retention’s” (nice way of saying commissions) from these convictions through the submission of the online forms the Bid Bond sf273, Performance Bond sf274 and Payment Bond sf275, through the DOJ at the Department of Fiscal Services website. The sample forms and spreadsheets clearly show this.

This incentivizes FRAUD to obtain and maintain high conviction rates. That’s not justice!

No wonder evidence is withheld, witnesses not allowed, no true jury of peers as defined in legal dictionaries such as Bouviers and Blacks Law. No wonder policy and procedures of the court discourage justice. No wonder hearsay evidence is allowed by prosecutors with no first hand witnesses under sworn testimony or affidavits.

No wonder why defense counsel is forced upon a man. So a living man cannot object, refute, rebuke, repudiate, scream hearsay at the top of his lungs, and stand firmly upon his rights, as a belligerent claimant should. No, he is hushed by counsel, declared an incompetent, a ward of state, unable to speak for oneself. Under duress and scare tactics talked in to waiving his/her rights and admitting guilt in a plea deal under threats of longer sentences. Lied to about the sentencing, the parole. All from hiring an ACTOR called the Attorney at BAR. Pretending he’s doing you a favor. **IS HEREBY FIRED FOR CAUSE**

Definition of Railroaded; is leading someone down a narrow predetermined path to a predetermined outcome. Definition of conspiracy; more than one railroading someone for profit.

No wonder that the ABA journal said; "**No fact or truth shall be tried in court**".

Where is the REMEDY? Where is the JUSTICE?

When a man in jail, has no access to a law library, or a computer, or the internet, little access to a phone, to prepare his appeal. When he has a public defender for 17 months and does not even know it, no communication, not one phone call. When he finds out about this public pretender by a law firm he hired to appeal and told they cannot help as he has a attorney he neither hired nor even knew about?

What then? Is this justice? Or is it conscripted fraud by STATE?

TRUST

63C Am. Jur. 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247: "As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer.

1. Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever be their

private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal financial gain from a discharge of their trusts.

2. That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or she serves.
3. In addition, owes a fiduciary duty to the public.
4. It has been said that the fiduciary responsibilities of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual.
5. Furthermore, it has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official, which tends to weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual rights is against public policy.

Will you honor the laws, rules, regulations, and operational requirements etc. of this government? Above are not my words; they are words of the government. It comes from their judicial bible.

Also, know this... Slaves cannot pay for anything, as all they have belongs to their master.

Beneficiaries cannot pay for anything, as that is the DUTY of the Trustee, who has a fiduciary duty to discharge the requirements of the trust. When do we pay for something? When we are dealing with people: not artificial entities, or public servants.

The government has no business in interfering in the private affairs of the people.

The government is doing its best to destroy any private affairs we might have.

CORPORATE AMERICA

Some of you might think the government is not a corporation. Below is a list and you ask yourself, then why did they file as a corporation? Feel free to check them out. Also, find out when they did this. This is not all of them, a small list, to illustrate a point.

Are governments, corporations? Are corporations, governments? If a corporation, were a government or government corporation, then a **citizen** of the government would have to be an **employee** of the corporation. - Congress

Can you be a citizen of Wal-Mart? Can Wal-Mart arrest you? Can Wal-Mart send you to jail or death row? Could Wal-Mart create your birth certificate, marriage license, driver's license, SS card. Or...

Just place the authority in your by-laws and create a sub-corporation to do it.

Examples:

- United Nations Order World Administration – Delaware Corporation File # 0942563
- United States of America Non-profit Organization #2193946
- United States Code Title 28, Part VI, Chapter 176, Subchapter A, § 3002; (15)
“United States” means, (A) a Federal corporation

- Federal Reserve Association Non-profit Religious Corporation #0042817
- Social Security Corporation for Profit Corporation #2213135
- Internal Revenue Service Representation, Inc. #2934047
- Central Intelligence Authority, Inc CIA for profit Delaware Corporation 2004409
- Prentice-Hall corporation system, Inc. Foreign business Corporation #623745
- State Bar of Arizona, Dun and Bradstreet #836504225
- Attorney General, Arizona Dun and Bradstreet# 161182845
- ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SAFETY Dun and Bradstreet #078291672
- United States of America vs. National Trust Co. Of Washington Domestic Non-profit Corporation #011855
- Maricopa Legal Defenders Office Dun and Bradstreet #039057754
- State of Arizona Attorney Generals Office Dun and Bradstreet #027803296
- Arizona Minority Bar Association Dun and Bradstreet #054060426
- County of Maricopa Dun and Bradstreet #161011445

OATHS

Oaths of office:

The Constitution for the United States of America; Article 6 § 1 Clause 3 "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution;." I ask, have they done so?

Article 2 §1 Clause 8 "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the Office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my Ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Title 5 § 3331. Oath of office An individual, except the President, elected or appointed to an office of honor or profit in the civil service or uniformed services, shall take the following oath:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

Judges have the Title 5 oath of office,

Another one for Judges found in Title 28, § 453 says...

Each justice or judge of the United States shall take the following oath or affirmation before performing the duties of his office:

"I, [NAME], do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all the duties incumbent upon me as [OFFICER] under the Constitution and laws of the United States. So help me God."

Government officials are to swear these oaths, people are not. Their duties include:

Protecting God given Rights of the people, Serving the people.

Establishing Freedom.

Public office holders must also be bonded.

Please pay very close attention here and NOTE THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE LAW!

TITLE 5 U.S. Code

Sec. 706. Scope of review

To the extent necessary to decision and when presented, the reviewing court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of an agency action. The reviewing court shall—

- (1) **compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed; and**
- (2) **hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be--**

(A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law;

(B) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; (C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right;

(D) without observance of procedure required by law;

(E) unsupported by substantial evidence in a case subject to sections 556 and 557 of this title or otherwise reviewed on the record of an agency hearing provided by statute; or

(F) unwarranted by the facts to the extent that the facts are subject to trial de novo by the reviewing court.

In making the foregoing determinations, the court shall review the whole record or those parts of it cited by a party, and due account shall be taken of the rule of prejudicial error.

Under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, you may sue state or local officials for the "deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and [federal laws]." Under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), you may sue federal officials for the violation of certain constitutional rights.

**ALL POWER IS INHERENT IN THE PEOPLE FOR THEIR EXCLUSIVE USE
ONLY OR ON GRANT PERMISSION FROM THEM!**

Therefore:

In the complete absence of any Lawful and verified Oath or Affirmation made by a Non participant Individual, to support any Constitution; or in the complete absence of proving a Higher Title to that REAL FLESH. Known and Described as the Non participant Individual Himself, In Personam Jurisdiction does not exist; the Constitution only protects Non participants, and in the complete absence of proving a Lawful and voluntary contract made by Such Non participant, pledging Himself and/or His Property- Rights to certain specified performance, Subject Matter Jurisdiction does not exist; and in the complete absence of any Lawful and verified complaint made against Such Non participant, wherein a Real Injured Party Claims a Damage, no criminal Jurisdictions exist; thus in the complete absence of proving the existence of either In Personam and or Subject Matter Jurisdiction, governmental Jurisdiction over the Non participant Individual does not exist.

QUOD ERAT DEMONSTRANDUM!

"If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same...they shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both..." Title 18, United States Code, Section 241.

"Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation or custom, willfully subjects any inhabitant of any State, territory or district to the deprivation of any rights, privileges or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United

States...shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both..." Title 18, United States Code, Section 242.

The Constitution never provided THE PEOPLE with Rights that they did not already possess prior to creation of this Instrument.

LOSS OF JUDICIAL IMMUNITY

It has also been well established that: When a judge knows that he\she lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid statutes expressly depriving him\her of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost. *Rankin v. Howard*, (1980) 633 F. 2d 844, cert den. *Zeller v. Rankin*, 101 S.Ct. 2020, 451 U.S. 939, 68 L.Ed 2d 326.

"Where there is no jurisdiction, there can be no discretion, for discretion is incident to jurisdiction." *Piper v. Pearson*, 2 Gray 120, cited in *Bradley v. Fisher*, 13 Wall. 335, 20 L.Ed. 646 (1872)

A judge must be acting within his jurisdiction as to subject matter and person, to be entitled to immunity from civil action for his acts. *Davis v. Burris*, 51 Ariz. 220, 75 P.2d 689 (1938)

Generally, judges are immune from suit for judicial acts within or in excess of their jurisdiction even if those acts have been done maliciously or corruptly; the only exception being for acts done in the clear absence of all jurisdiction.

Gregory v. Thompson, 500 F2d 59 (C.A. Ariz. 1974)

There is a general rule that a ministerial officer who acts wrongfully, although in good faith, is nevertheless liable in a civil action and cannot claim the immunity

of the sovereign. *Cooper v. O'Conner*, 99 F.2d 133

When a judicial officer acts entirely without jurisdiction or without compliance with jurisdiction requisites he may be held civilly liable for abuse of process even though his act involved a decision made in good faith, that he had jurisdiction. *State use of Little v. U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co.*, 217 Miss. 576, 64 So. 2d 697.

"... the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void, and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument." *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch 137 (1803).

"No judicial process, whatever form it may assume, can have any lawful authority outside of the limits of the jurisdiction of the court or judge by whom it is issued; and an attempt to enforce it beyond these boundaries is nothing less than lawless violence." *Ableman v. Booth*, 21 Howard 506 (1859).

"The courts are not bound by an officer's interpretation of the law under which he presumes to act." *Hoffsomer v. Hayes*, 92 Okla 32, 227 F 417.

ALL SEATS OF GOVERNMENT HAVE BEEN VACATED

December 26, 1933 49 Statute 3097 Treaty Series 881 (Convention on Rights and Duties of States) stated CONGRESS replaced STATUTES with international law, placing all STATES under international law.

December 9, 1945, the International Organization Immunities Act relinquished every public office of United States to the United Nations.

22 CFR 92.12-92.31 FR Heading "Foreign Relationship" states that an oath is required to take office.

Title 8 USC 1481 states once an oath of office is taken, citizenship is relinquished, thus one becomes a foreign entity, agency, or state. That means every public office is a foreign state, including all political subdivisions. (i.e. every single court is considered a separate foreign entity).

Title 22 USC (Foreign relations and Intercourse) Chapter 11 identifies all public officials as foreign agents.

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) 4j states that the Court jurisdiction and immunity fall under a foreign state.

In *Chisholm*, the Justices of the Supreme Court rejected Georgia's claim to be sovereign. They concluded instead that, to the extent the term "sovereignty" is even appropriately applied to the newly adopted Constitution, sovereignty rests with the people, rather than with state governments.

Furthermore, Wilson argued that the citizens of Georgia, when they acted upon the large scale of the Union, as a part of the "People of the United States," did not surrender the Supreme or sovereign Power to that State; but, as to the purposes of the Union, retained it to themselves. As to the purposes of the Union, therefore, Georgia is NOT a sovereign State.

In other words, according to Justice Wilson, to the extent one wishes to use the

word "sovereignty" at all, sovereignty lies in the people themselves, not in any government formed by the people.

This is the principle that "laws derived from the pure source of equality and justice must be founded on the CONSENT of those, whose obedience they require. The sovereign, when traced to his source, must be found in the man." In other words, obedience must rest on the consent of the only "sovereign" from which justice and equality rest: the individual person who is asked to obey the law. Wilson believed that the only reason "a free man is bound by human laws, is, that he binds himself.

"If one free man, an original sovereign, may do all this; why may not an aggregate of free men, a collection of original sovereigns, do this likewise? If the dignity of each singly is undiminished; the dignity of all jointly must be unimpaired."

From this analysis Wilson reached the following conclusion about Georgia's claim of sovereign immunity against a suit for breach of contract:

"A State, like a merchant, makes a contract. A dishonest State, like a dishonest merchant, willfully refuses to discharge it: The latter is amenable to a Court of Justice: Upon general principles of right, shall the former when summoned to answer the fair demands of its creditor, be permitted, proteus-like, to assume a new appearance, and to insult him and justice, by declaring I am a Sovereign State? Surely not.

That Justice Wilson was the author of this opinion is significant. James Wilson was as crucial a member of the Constitutional Convention as any other, including James Madison.

"The doctrine of judicial immunity originated in early seventeenth-century England in the jurisprudence of Sir Edward Coke. In two decisions, *Floyd* &

Barker and the Case of the Marshalsea, Lord Coke laid the foundation for the doctrine of judicial immunity." Floyd & Barker, 77 Eng. Rep. 1305 (1607; The Case of the Marshalsea, 77 Eng. Rep. 1027 (1612) were both cases right out of the Star Chamber.

Coke's reasoning for judicial immunity was presented in four public policy grounds:

1. Finality of judgment;
2. Maintenance of judicial independence;
3. Freedom from continual calumniations; and,
4. Respect and confidence in the judiciary.

The Marshalsea presents a case where Coke denied a judge immunity for presiding over a case in assumpsit.

Assumpsit is a common-law action for recovery of damages for breach of contract. Coke then explained the operation of jurisdiction requirement for immunity:

"[W]hen a Court has

- (a) jurisdiction of the cause, and proceeds iverso ordine or erroneously, there the party who sues, or the officer or minister of the Court who executes the precept or process of the Court, no action lies against them. But...
- (b) when the Court has not jurisdiction of the cause, there the whole proceeding is [before a person who is not a judge], and actions will lie against them without any regard of the precept or process..."

It's one big serpent isn't it ?

Definition of serpent - a large snake., a sly or treacherous person, especially one who exploits a position of trust in order to betray it.

Definition of serpent. 1a archaic : a noxious creature that creeps, hisses, or stings. b : snake. 2 : devil sense 1. 3 : a treacherous person.

A serpent is a snake. ... Serpents have represented qualities ranging from evil to fertility to poison throughout history, and even today the symbol of medicine is a staff entwined by a serpent. The Latin root is serpentem, "creeping thing," from serpere, "to creep." A serpent is a snake

All deceptive and all tricks of the legal trade ... serpent like

Extrinsic Evidence: Extrinsic Fraud is commonly associated with Legal Malpractice in that it happens in a means wherein your attorney merely engages in Willful Suppression of critical Material Evidence.

Conspiracy: Many cases where your own attorney is actually decided to take on your case with the Intention of actually Working In Concert with the opposing party. Although that may seem like a heinous act and is all to common and even widely accepted by the powers that govern their authority such as the court staff, the State Bar and the sitting Judicial Officer.

**All Members of the same union... The Conspiracy of the BAR
Lady Justice is hereby pronounced... DEAD**

Conclusion

"Your Honor, administrator, my bond is being used to fund these proceedings. I wish to subrogate the case contract, eliminate the record, and dismiss all charges with extreme prejudice." I wish to live a free inhabitant.

"I Pray to God, to direct this administrator of this case contract to be dismissed with prejudice and the proceedings to be eliminated from the record and for the Prosecutor to pay me three times damages for my harm suffered and inconvenience in bringing false charges."

(In addition to the STATE OF ARIZONA's cost of \$1440. Per DAY) If he fails to do so, he is in Dishonor and you can ask the Bailiff to arrest him for Gross

Negligence and Fraud Upon the Court.

1)"Notice to Clerk" I hereby Mandate you to record this Affidavit and Demand as one of we the people that it be made available on The record under the above referenced case #, so it may be put on the public record and found, and the record corrected, until such time of my dismissal and release.

2)The use of notary below is for the explicit purpose of both a "**Jurat Certificate**" and for "**Identification**", and such use does not grant any "jurisdiction" to anyone other than I, for or on my own behalf. definition/meaning of jurisdiction juris = law diction = words

I, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, as Principal Creditor, and Beneficiary of the Cestui Que Vie trust by Special Appearance only, do hereby appoint you judge and administrator as trust fiduciary and command you to settle this matter.

On my knees before God, through his beloved Son, Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, a man, A servant of the Lord. Amen.

Proceeding hereby and forever as Sui Juris, a Non Representative, Non Agent, Non Personam, by all rights and all powers as ordered by the 9th and 10th amendment of Bill of Rights and Bill of Provisions by The United States of America Constitution. And in accord with the supreme treaties listed in this document including the ICCPR. (1976) Signed by United States 1993.


As One of We the People, I, do hereby politely and with honor, command you, our public servant to follow this Mandate directive and **Void Ab Initio**. **FOR CAUSE, STATUS, STANDING, FRAUD AND lack of JURISDICTION.**

PER; 28 U.S. Code § 1746 - Unsworn declarations under penalty of perjury

(1) If executed without the United States: "I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on January 14, 2019. (date)

without prejudice, and without recourse, I, hereby place my Autograph below



Jessica Mann; Kahraman

Jessica Mann; Kahraman

FURTHER I SAYETH NOT.

This document is now hereby publicly published and placed upon the record. You have 21 days to respond. This Affidavit un-rebutted shall become the judgement. I will then publicly publish your responses or your non responses.

Notary as JURAT CERTIFICATE

Arizona State of }

Maricopa County }

On 1/14/19 date before me,

Ariel Hutchinson a Notary Public, personally appeared Jessica Mann; Kahraman who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the woman whose Name is subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to Me that he executed the same in his authorized capacity,

And that by his autograph(s) on the instrument the man executed, the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the lawful laws of Arizona State and the STATE OF ARIZONA that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct. WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Signature



of Notary / Jurat

seal



Notice to agents is notice to principal, Notice to principal is notice to agent.

This is The End of this affidavit; Only, the Additional pages of the Certified proof of service and the Certified Judgement of un-rebutted Affidavit may be Bound to this document.

Affidavit

Comes now Affiant, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, a living woman, Presenting as Evidence of the following facts.

1. I do believe this woman, Sarah Kramer, is a private contractor of a private company that is under contract for the Title IV-E funds and not for wrongs;
2. I require this woman, Sarah Kramer, to swear under the penalty of perjury that she has first-hand knowledge of any wrong done by me;
3. Any information given by me was done under threat, duress and coercion under the guise that DCS was a government entity and not a private corporation. I do not wish to work with private companies or accept any benefits or services;
4. There has never been any abuse or neglect of my biological property; {See Exhibits A and B}
5. If this woman, Sarah Kramer, believes my claim is not true, she must make a claim in the form of an affidavit under oath or affirmation and under the penalty of perjury within seven days. Any failure to do so will be considered a trespass and I will charge \$5,000 a day per biological property to be paid immediately; {See Exhibits A and B}

Verification

I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 14th day of January 20 19.



Jessica, Kahn & Mann
Jessica Mann; Kahraman

Notary

On this 14 day of January, 20 19; before me Jessica Mann Kahraman the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living man described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that he executed the same of his free will act and deed.

Ariel Hutchinson
Notary

My commission expires: 11/8/2020



Affidavit

Comes now Affiant, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, a living woman, Presenting as Evidence of the following facts.

1. I do believe this woman, Sarah Mendez, is a private contractor of a private company that is under contract for the Title IV-E funds and not for wrongs;
2. I require this woman, Sarah Mendez, to swear under the penalty of perjury that she has first-hand knowledge of any wrong done by me;
3. Any information given by me was done under threat, duress and coercion under the guise that DCS was a government entity and not a private corporation. I do not wish to work with private companies or accept any benefits or services;
4. There has never been any abuse or neglect of my biological property; {See Exhibits A and B}
5. If this woman, Sarah Mendez, believes my claim is not true, she must make a claim in the form of an affidavit under oath or affirmation and under the penalty of perjury within seven days. Any failure to do so will be considered a trespass and I will charge \$5,000 a day per biological property to be paid immediately; {See Exhibits A and B}

Verification

I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 14th day of January 20 19.



Jessica; Kah a woman
Jessica Mann; Kahraman

Notary

On this 14 day of January 2019; before me Jessica Mann Kah the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living woman described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that she executed the same of his free will act and deed.

Ariel Hutchinson
Notary

My commission expires: 11/8/2020



**Affidavit**

Comes now Affiant, Ahmet; Kahraman, a competent living man of sound mind and body. I am Sui Juris, by special appearance only, as stated at the Initial Dependency Hearing of January 9, 2019, case number JD532206, for which I am provided the Clerk's notes by mail. I am rebutting the statements contained herein, based on misrepresentation of facts:

The use of any statutes, codes, rules, regulations, or court citations, within any document created by Me, at any time, is only to notice that which is applicable to government officials, and is not intended, nor shall it be construed, to mean that I have conferred, submitted to, or entered into any jurisdiction alluded to thereby and further.

1. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 1, I was not present at the hearing, but clearly stated to be there by **special appearance only**;

2. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 2: All attendees of the hearing were **instructed** by the Court to disclose their email addresses to me for delivery of documents filed upon the court and presented as evidence, yet the record states that Mr. Udall **admonished** all attendees from disclosing any personally identifiable information;

3. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 3: The document states, "LET THE RECORD REFLECT that the Department, through their agent, has provided Mother and Father with a copy of the dependency petition." Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal and Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent. When Agent happens to be the Assistant Attorney General for the State and contracted to receive Title IV-E funds, the Agent, Department and State are actively engaging in barratry, i.e. paid for the removal of the children. *State v. Batson, 17 S.E.2d 511 (N.C. 1941)*

4. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 4, I asserted that I am **Sui Juris**, not representing myself, as incorrectly stated in all further proceedings;

5. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 5: I have knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily chosen to waive my right to counsel and proceed **Sui Juris**, not on my own behalf, as incorrectly stated;

6. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 6: service was **not accepted**, as the petition was returned to the Assistant Attorney General's office by email and certified mail on January 11, 2019, with the following red ink notations on every page: "We do not accept the terms and services of your contract."
7. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 7: IT IS ORDERED denying the request for Advisory Council as I assert my stance as **Sui Juris**, which is not the same as proceeding on my own behalf;
8. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 8: "Services to be **offered** to Mother and Father will be psychological evaluations and therapeutic visitation." **No services are accepted**. I object to the use of the word "offered," which is accurately **coercion** into , as noted by the WARNING at the end of Page 5, which states: "As a parent, it is your **responsibility** to cooperate with all services offered, and work toward the return of your children, A failure to do so, within a reasonable period of time, may mean losing your children forever through termination of your rights and adoption."
9. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 9 regarding Form I, Notice to Parent in Dependency Action, I do **not agree** to the terms and conditions of your services. I do **not** contract for services. I rebut the statement, "if you do not participate in reunification services...the Court may terminate your parental rights or appoint a permanent guardian for your child." As a living man, Sui Juris, this court and DCS have no jurisdiction over me, and have no authority to coerce me to accept services in order to retain possession of our biological property {See Exhibits B and C}. I hereby demand their immediate return to our loving care;
10. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 10, I **object** to the order continuing the children, **D.K.** **Kemal**; **Kahraman** and **K.K.** **Troy**; **Kahraman**, as temporary wards of the Court, committed to the care, custody and control of the Department of Child Safety. DCS unlawfully and fraudulently took custody of our biological property. We demand the immediate return of our biological property. Further, Mr. Udall is committing misprision of felony, as per 18 U.S. Code § 4.
11. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 11: The Department of Child Safety has made **no reasonable efforts** to prevent removal of the biological property from the home, and it was **not reasonable to make no efforts** to maintain the biological property in the home. **D.K.** **Keman**; **Kahraman**, a boy, was in good health, under no danger while

under our care, and **K.K.** Kemal; Kahraman, a boy, was brought willingly and of our own volition to the hospital, where we were defrauded by DCS and medical staff, while there seeking help for his condition. Both boys, our biological property, were unlawfully removed without warrant, under duress and the fraudulent representation of themselves as a government agency, instead of as a private corporation, benefitting from Title IV-E funds.

12. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 12, I object to this matter being set for Conference without the Court having reviewed the affidavits and exhibits filed upon the Court. According to Rule 44, it was an obstruction of justice that our documents were rejected, as they had been properly filed upon the Court, and were returned to us before the hearing, with the documents being out of original order. We had not been provided a list of all involved parties at that time;
13. In rebuttal to Exhibit, line item 13, it is an infringement of my First Amendment right to order me to remove any personal identifying information, photographs, etc. that have been posted online, and to order that no further personal identifying information be posted. The Court and DCS have no jurisdiction to make such an unconstitutional order of myself, a living man, Sui Juris, by special appearance only under God;
14. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 14, I object to the following coercion to contract for services: "WARNING : As a parent, it is your **responsibility** to cooperate with all services offered, and work toward the return of your children, A failure to do so, within a reasonable period of time, may mean losing your children forever through termination of your rights and adoption." I do **not** agree to the terms and conditions of your services, and do not agree to contract.
15. Any man or woman who denies my claim is true must write an affidavit sworn under the penalty of perjury and having first-hand knowledge of the facts. Any man or woman makes statements without first-hand knowledge commits trespass upon the name of I. {See Exhibits B and C}

Verification


I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 15th day of January 2019.



Ahmet; Kahraman

Notary

On this 15 day of Jan, 2019; before me  the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living man described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that he executed the same of his free will act and deed.


Notary

My commission expires: 4/1/2020



Name of Person Filing:
Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Day/Evening Telephone:

Jessica Mann; Kahraman
1118 S Longmore 95
Mesa AZ Zip Exempt
480 455 9899

CHRIS DEROSA, CLERK
MANN, JESSICA DEP
FILED
2019 JAN 16 PM 3:09
FOR CLERK'S USE ONLY

**SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
IN MARICOPA COUNTY**

Case Number: JD 532206

IN THE MATTER OF:

Dylan Kemal; Kahraman
Kenan Troy; Kahraman

Title of Document:

Affidavit

RESTRICTED

See attached document



Attn: David K. Udal
Case # JDS32206

The foregoing affidavit was mailed via Certified US Mail on January 15, 2019 to:

Clerk of the Court
Maricopa County Superior Court
Juvenile Court Southeast Facility
1810 South Lewis Street
Mesa, AZ 85210

The foregoing affidavit was filed with the Clerk on January 16, 2019

Clerk of the Court
Maricopa County Superior Court
Juvenile Court Southeast Facility
1810 South Lewis Street
Mesa, AZ 85210

Clerk of the Court for Delivery to:
David K. Udall
Maricopa County Superior Court
Juvenile Court Southeast Facility
1810 South Lewis Street
Mesa, AZ 85210

**Certified True Original Copies of the foregoing sent certified
US Mail this 16th day of January, 2019 to:**

Mark Brnovich
Office of the Attorney General
120 W. 1st Avenue, 2nd Floor
Mesa, AZ 85210

Kathleen Martoncik
Office of the Attorney General
120 W. 1st Avenue, 2nd Floor
Mesa, AZ 85210

Megan Haywood, Attorney at Law
222 N. Central Ave. Ste. 154
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Foster Care Review Board
1501 W. Washington, Suite 128
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Sarah Kramer, Case Worker
Arizona Department of Child Safety
1201 S. Alma School Road #1100
Mesa, AZ 85210

**Madison M. Bell, Case Worker
Arizona Department of Child Safety
1201 S. Alma School Road #1100
Mesa, AZ 85210**

**Sarah Mendez, Case Supervisor
Arizona Department of Child Safety
1201 S. Alma School Road #1100
Mesa, AZ 85210**

Verification

I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 16th day of January 2019.


Jessica Mann; Kahraman

Notary

On this 16 day of Jan, 2015; before me Jessica Mann Kasten the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living woman described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that she executed the same of his free will act and deed.

Notary

My commission expires: 1/7/22



Affidavit

Comes now Affiant, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, a competent living woman of sound mind and body. I am Sui Juris, an Arizona State National, by special appearance only, as stated at the Initial Dependency Hearing of January 9, 2019, case number JD532206, for which I am provided the Clerk's notes by mail. I am rebutting the statements contained herein, based on misrepresentation of facts:

The use of any statutes, codes, rules, regulations, or court citations, within any document created by Me, at any time, is only to notice that which is applicable to government officials, and is not intended, nor shall it be construed, to mean that I have conferred, submitted to, or entered into any jurisdiction alluded to thereby and further.

1. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 1, I was not present at the hearing, but clearly stated to be there by **special appearance only**;
2. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 2: All attendees of the hearing were **instructed** by the Court to disclose their email addresses to me for delivery of documents filed upon the court and presented as evidence, yet the record states that Mr. Udall **admonished** all attendees from disclosing any personally identifiable information;
3. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 3: The document states, "LET THE RECORD REFLECT that the Department, through their agent, has provided Mother and Father with a copy of the dependency petition." Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal and Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent. When Agent happens to be the Assistant Attorney General for the State and contracted to receive Title IV-E funds, the Agent, Department and State are actively engaging in barratry, i.e. paid for the removal of the biological property. *State v. Batson, 17 S.E.2d 511 (N.C. 1941)*
4. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 4, I asserted that I am **Sui Juris**, not representing myself, as incorrectly stated in all further proceedings;
5. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 5: I have knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily chosen to waive my right to counsel and proceed **Sui Juris**, not on my own behalf, as incorrectly stated;

6. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 6: service was **not accepted**, as the petition was returned to the Assistant Attorney General's office by email and certified mail on January 11, 2019, with the following red ink notations on every page: "We do not accept the terms and services of your contract."
7. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 7: IT IS ORDERED denying the request for Advisory Council as I assert my stance as **Sui Juris**, which is not the same as proceeding on my own behalf;
8. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 8: "Services to be **offered** to Mother and Father will be psychological evaluations and therapeutic visitation." **No services are accepted**. I object to the use of the word "offered," which is accurately **coercion** into, as noted by the WARNING at the end of Page 5, which states: As a parent, it is your **responsibility** to cooperate with all services offered, and work toward the return of your biological property. A failure to do so, within a reasonable period of time, may mean losing your biological property forever through termination of your rights and adoption.
9. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 9 regarding Form I, Notice to Parent in Dependency Action, I do **not** agree to the terms and conditions of your services. I do **not** contract for services. I rebut the statement which says if you do not participate in reunification services...the Court may terminate your parental rights or appoint a permanent guardian for your biological property. As a living woman, Arizona State National, **Sui Juris**, this court and DCS have no jurisdiction over me, and have no authority to coerce me to accept services in order to retain possession of our biological property {See Exhibits B and C}. I hereby demand their immediate return to our loving care;
10. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 10, I **object** to the order continuing our biological property, **D.K.** Kemal; **Kahraman** and **K.K.** Troy; Kahraman, as temporary wards of the Court, committed to the care, custody and control of the Department of Child Safety. DCS unlawfully and fraudulently took custody of our biological property. We demand the immediate return of our biological property. Further, Mr. Udall is committing misprision of felony, as per 18 U.S. Code § 4.
11. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 11: The Department of Child Safety has made **no reasonable efforts** to prevent removal of the biological property from the home, and it was **not reasonable to make no efforts** to maintain the biological property in the home. **D.K.** Kemal; Kahraman, a boy, was in good health, under no danger while

under our care, and **K.K.** Kemal; Kahraman, a boy, was brought willingly and of our own volition to the hospital, where we were defrauded by DCS and medical staff, while there seeking help for his condition. Both boys, our biological property, were unlawfully removed without warrant, under duress and the fraudulent representation of themselves as a government agency, instead of as a private corporation, benefitting from Title IV-E funds.

12. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 12, I object to this matter being set for Conference without the Court having reviewed the affidavits and exhibits filed upon the Court. According to Rule 44, it was an obstruction of justice that our documents were rejected, as they had been properly filed upon the Court, and were returned to us before the hearing, with the documents being out of original order. We had not been provided a list of all involved parties at that time;
13. In rebuttal to Exhibit, line item 13, it is an infringement of my First Amendment right to order me to remove any personal identifying information, photographs, etc. that have been posted online, and to order that no further personal identifying information be posted. The Court and DCS have no jurisdiction to make such an unconstitutional order of myself, a living man, Sui Juris, by special appearance only under God;
14. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 14, I object to the following coercion to contract for services: **WARNING : As a parent, it is your responsibility to cooperate with all services offered, and work toward the return of your biological property. A failure to do so, within a reasonable period of time, may mean losing your biological property forever through termination of your rights and adoption. I do not agree to the terms and conditions of your services, and do not agree to contract.**
15. Any man or woman who denies my claim is true must write an affidavit sworn under the penalty of perjury and having first-hand knowledge of the facts. Any man or woman makes statements without first-hand knowledge commits trespass upon the name of I. {See Exhibits B and C}

Verification

I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 16th day of January 2019.

Jessica Mann; Kahraman

Jessica Mann; Kahraman


Notary

On this 16 day of Jan, 2019; before me Jessica Mann; Kahraman, the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living woman described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that she executed the same of his free will act and deed.

Dale L.

Notary

My commission expires: 1/7/22



7018 22900 00001 7131 7740

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com.

MESA, AZ 85210

Certified Mail Fee	\$3.45
Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)	\$2.75
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt (hardcopy)	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Return Receipt (electronic)	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Mail Restricted Delivery	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Required	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Adult Signature Restricted Delivery	\$0.00
Postage	\$1.42
Total Postage and Fees	\$7.62

Street and Apt. No. or PO Box No.
 1810 S. Lewis Street
 City, State, ZIP+4
 Mesa, Arizona 85210

0069 37
 JAN 15 2019
 01/15/2019
 Postmark Here

See Reverse for Instructions

Affidavit

Comes now Affiant, Ahmet; Kahraman, a competent living man of sound mind and body. I am Sui Juris, by special appearance only, as stated at the Initial Dependency Hearing of January 9, 2019, case number JD532206, for which I am provided the Clerk's notes by mail. I am rebutting the statements contained herein, based on misrepresentation of facts:

The use of any statutes, codes, rules, regulations, or court citations, within any document created by Me, at any time, is only to notice that which is applicable to government officials, and is not intended, nor shall it be construed, to mean that I have conferred, submitted to, or entered into any jurisdiction alluded to thereby and further.

1. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 1, I was not present at the hearing, but clearly stated to be there by **special appearance only**;

2. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 2: All attendees of the hearing were **instructed** by the Court to disclose their email addresses to me for delivery of documents filed upon the court and presented as evidence, yet the record states that Mr. Udall **admonished** all attendees from disclosing any personally identifiable information;

3. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 3: The document states, "LET THE RECORD REFLECT that the Department, through their agent, has provided Mother and Father with a copy of the dependency petition." Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal and Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent. When Agent happens to be the Assistant Attorney General for the State and contracted to receive Title IV-E funds, the Agent, Department and State are actively engaging in barratry, i.e. paid for the removal of the children. *State v. Bajson, 17 S.E.2d 511 (N.C. 1941)*

4. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 4, I asserted that I am **Sui Juris**, not representing myself, as incorrectly stated in all further proceedings;

5. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 5: I have knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily chosen to waive my right to counsel and proceed **Sui Juris**, not on my own behalf, as incorrectly stated;

6. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 6: service was not accepted, as the petition was returned to the Assistant Attorney General's office by email and certified mail on January 11, 2019, with the following red ink notations on every page: "We do not accept the terms and services of your contract."
7. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 7: IT IS ORDERED denying the request for Advisory Council as I assert my stance as **Sui Juris**, which is not the same as proceeding on my own behalf;
8. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 8: "Services to be offered to Mother and Father will be psychological evaluations and therapeutic visitation." **No services are accepted.** I object to the use of the word "offered," which is accurately **coercion** into , as noted by the WARNING at the end of Page 5, which states: "As a parent, it is your responsibility to cooperate with all services offered, and work toward the return of your children, A failure to do so, within a reasonable period of time, may mean losing your children forever through termination of your rights and adoption."
9. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 9 regarding Form I, Notice to Parent in Dependency Action, I do not agree to the terms and conditions of your services. I do not contract for services. I rebut the statement, "if you do not participate in reunification services...the Court may terminate your parental rights or appoint a permanent guardian for your child." As a living man, Sui Juris, this court and DCS have no jurisdiction over me, and have no authority to coerce me to accept services in order to retain possession of our biological property {See Exhibits B and C}. I hereby demand their immediate return to our loving care;
10. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 10, I object to the order continuing the children, **D.K.** **Kemal**; **Kahraman** and **K.K.** **Troy**; **Kahraman**, as temporary wards of the Court, committed to the care, custody and control of the Department of Child Safety. DCS unlawfully and fraudulently took custody of our biological property. We demand the immediate return of our biological property. Further, Mr. Udall is committing misprision of felony, as per 18 U.S. Code § 4.
11. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 11: The Department of Child Safety has made no reasonable efforts to prevent removal of the biological property from the home, and it was not reasonable to make no efforts to maintain the biological property in the home. **D.K.** **Keman**; **Kahraman**, a boy, was in good health, under no danger while


under our care, and KK, Kemal; Kahraman, a boy, was brought willingly and of our own volition to the hospital, where we were defrauded by DCS and medical staff, while there seeking help for his condition. Both boys, our biological property, were unlawfully removed without warrant, under duress and the fraudulent representation of themselves as a government agency, instead of as a private corporation, benefitting from Title IV-E funds.

12. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 12, I object to this matter being set for Conference without the Court having reviewed the affidavits and exhibits filed upon the Court. According to Rule 44, it was an obstruction of justice that our documents were rejected, as they had been properly filed upon the Court, and were returned to us before the hearing, with the documents being out of original order. We had not been provided a list of all involved parties at that time;
13. In rebuttal to Exhibit, line item 13, it is an infringement of my First Amendment right to order me to remove any personal identifying information, photographs, etc. that have been posted online, and to order that no further personal identifying information be posted. The Court and DCS have no jurisdiction to make such an unconstitutional order of myself, a living man, Sui Juris, by special appearance only under God;
14. In rebuttal to Exhibit A, line item 14, I object to the following coercion to contract for services: "WARNING : As a parent, it is your **responsibility** to cooperate with all services offered, and work toward the return of your children, A failure to do so, within a reasonable period of time, may mean losing your children forever through termination of your rights and adoption." I do **not** agree to the terms and conditions of your services, and do not agree to contract.
15. Any man or woman who denies my claim is true must write an affidavit sworn under the penalty of perjury and having first-hand knowledge of the facts. Any man or woman makes statements without first-hand knowledge commits trespass upon the name of I. {See Exhibits B and C}

Verification

I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 16th day of January 2019.


Ahmet; Kahraman

Notary

On this 16 day of Jan, 2019; before me Ahmet Kahraman the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living man described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that he executed the same of his free will act and deed.


Notary

My commission expires: 1/7/22




EXhibit A

Exhibit A

Clerk of the Superior Court
*** Electronically Filed ***
1/10/2019 8:00 AM

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

1/9/2019

HON. DAVID K. UDALL

CLERK OF THE COURT

M. Brady
Deputy

IN THE MATTER OF:

D.K. KEMAL KAHRAMAN

MEGAN J HAYWOOD

F1149031

DOB: [REDACTED] 2012

K.K. TROY KAHRAMAN

Closed

F1149032

DOB: [REDACTED] 2012

LISA BODDINGTON

BERNADETTE BURICK

JESSICA WREN KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA AZ 85202

SUZANNE M NICHOLLS

AHMET KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA AZ 85202FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD
DCS SPECIALIST - CENTRAL REGION
LEGAL ADVOCATE-JUVENILE
LEGAL DEFENDER-JUV-SEF
PUBLIC ADVOCATE-JUVENILE-
DEPENDENCY

PRELIMINARY PROTECTIVE HEARING

Docket Code IDH

Form JDInitDepHrg

Page 1

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

1/9/2019

INITIAL DEPENDENCY HEARING
DEPENDENCY CONTESTED

9:29 a.m. This matter is digitally recorded in Courtroom 6.

This is the time set for Preliminary Protective Hearing on a Dependency Petition filed 1/3/2019.

This is also the time set for Initial Dependency Hearing on a dependency petition filed 1/3/2019.

① Present: Assistant Attorney General Katie Martoncik; Guardian ad Litem for the children, Megan Haywood; DCS Child Safety Specialist, Sarah Kramer and Madison Bell; proposed counsel for Mother, Bernadette Burick; proposed counsel for Father, Suzanne Nicholls; Mother, Jessica Kahraman; Father, Ahmet Kahraman; friends of family.

The Court is advised the Preliminary Protective Conference did not proceed.

② All attendees of the hearing are admonished by the Court from disclosing any personally identifiable information mentioned in the proceedings and that doing so shall be deemed in contempt of court.

③ LET THE RECORD REFLECT that the Department, through their agent, has provided Mother and Father with a copy of the dependency petition.

IT IS ORDERED affirming the appointment of Megan Haywood as guardian ad litem for the children, D.K. Kahraman and K.K. Kahraman, in all further proceedings in this matter.

Mother makes an oral request to represent herself in all further proceedings. 

A

Father makes an oral report to represent himself in all further proceedings.

Upon inquiry by the Court, Mother and Father both deny having taken any drugs, alcohol or medication affecting lucidity within the last twenty-four (24) hours.

Mother and Father are advised of their rights to counsel in this matter.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

1/9/2019

Mother and Father both advise the Court that the contemplated waiver is not the result of any force, threats or promises.

THE COURT FINDS that Mother and Father both understand their rights and have knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily chosen to waive their right to counsel and proceed on their own behalf in all further proceedings.

IT IS ORDERED relieving Suzanne Nicholls and the Office of the Public Advocate as counsel of record for Father in all further proceedings.

IT IS ORDERED relieving Bernadette Burick and the Office of the Legal Defender as counsel of record for Mother in all further proceedings.

⑥ Service is accepted and defects are waived by Mother and Father.

Mother and Father wish to contest the allegations of the petition.

IT IS ORDERED entering a denial to the petition on behalf of Mother and Father.

This matter is not subject to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

The Department moves to assign advisory counsel to Mother and Father.

Discussion is held.

⑦ IT IS ORDERED denying the request as Mother and Father request to proceed on their own behalf.

⑧ Services to be offered to Mother and Father will be psychological evaluations and therapeutic visitation. Visitation is available while a therapeutic visitation provider is assigned.

⑨ Form I, Notice to Parent in Dependency Action, is read and provided to both parents.
⑩ Mother and Father indicate their understanding of same.

⑪ IT IS ORDERED continuing the children, D.K. Kemal Kahraman and K.K. Troy Kahraman, as temporary wards of the Court, committed to the care, custody and control of the Department of Child Safety.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

1/9/2019

(11) THE COURT FINDS that the Department of Child Safety has made reasonable efforts to prevent the removal of the children from the home and that continuation in the home would be contrary to the welfare of the children, or that it was reasonable to make no efforts to maintain the children in the home.

(12) IT IS ORDERED setting this matter for Conference - Pretrial - Contested Dependency regarding the parents

on 1/29/2019
at 9:00 AM
before Honorable David K. Udall
at the Maricopa County Juvenile Court Center
Southeast Facility, 1810 S. Lewis St., Mesa, AZ 85210

NOTICE

If a party fails to appear for the Pretrial Conference, the failure to appear may be deemed as an admission to all the facts in the petition and the Court may proceed to an adjudication of the ultimate issues.

If the petitioner fails to appear, the failure to appear may be deemed as a failure to prosecute and this matter may be dismissed.

If a party or a party's attorney fails to obey a pretrial order, or fails to appear at a Pretrial Conference, or is substantially unprepared to participate in the Conference or if a party or party's attorney fails to participate in good faith, the Court, upon motion or on its own initiative, may make such orders with regard to such conduct as are just, including among others, any of the orders provided in Rule 44 of the Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court.

The Department provides the Court, Mother and Father with a Motion for Protective Order.

Discussion is held.

Over Mother and Father's objection,

(13) IT IS ORDERED granting DCS's Motion for Protective Order all in accordance with the formal written Order signed by the Court on 1/9/2019 and filed (entered) by the Clerk on 1/9/2019.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

1/9/2019

(14) IT IS ORDERED that Mother, Father, representatives and/or interested parties shall remove any personal identifying information, photographs, etc. that have been posted online.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Mother, Father, representatives and/or interested parties shall not post any personal identifying information, photographs, etc. online.

IT IS ORDERED affirming the Dependency - Permanency Planning/Age 3-17 Years

on 11/18/2019
at 8:30 AM
before Honorable David K. Udall
at the Maricopa County Juvenile Court Center
Southeast Facility, 1810 S. Lewis St., Mesa, AZ 85210

This Courtroom utilizes an electronic recording system for the Court's record. If a court reporter is needed, a written request must be filed with the Clerk of the Court and a copy provided to the assigned judicial officer at least 72 hours before the commencement of the proceeding.

To order a copy of the audio record on compact disc (CD), please call Juvenile Court Administration (Durango facility - 602-506-4533/Southeast facility - 602-506-2544). There will be a fee of \$30 for each copy of the Superior Court proceedings. All copies will be provided using Court-supplied media.

9:44 a.m. Court adjourns.

Filed:

Mother for Protective Order
Order Granting DCS's Motion for Protective Order
Verification

(14) WARNING

As a parent, it is your responsibility to cooperate with all services offered, and work toward return of your children. A failure to do so, within a reasonable period of time, may mean losing your children forever through termination of your rights and adoption.

Case Name: _____

Case Number: JD _____

FORM 1
NOTICE TO PARENT IN DEPENDENCY ACTION

You are a party in a dependency case. If the Court determines that your child is dependent, then the Court will make decisions about the care and custody of your child until you demonstrate that you are able to do so. Except as otherwise provided by law, court hearings relating to dependent children are open to the public. You may request that the hearings be closed, and the Court may order them closed for good cause. If you cannot be reunited with your child within legal time frames, the Court may terminate your parental rights and your child may be adopted, or the Court may appoint a permanent guardian for your child. As a parent or Indian custodian in a dependency case, your legal rights include:

1. The right to counsel, including court appointed counsel if you are indigent;
2. The right to trial by the Court on the allegations in the dependency petition;
3. The right to cross-examine witnesses who are called to testify against you; and
4. The right to use the process of the court to compel the attendance of witnesses.

As part of this case, there will be additional court hearings. You are required to attend all court hearings. If you cannot attend a court hearing, you must prove to the Court that you had good cause for not attending. If you fail to attend the Pre-trial Conference, Settlement Conference, or Dependency Adjudication Hearing without good cause, the Court may determine that you have waived your legal rights and admitted the allegations in the dependency petition. The Court may go forward with the Dependency Adjudication Hearing in your absence and may rule that your child is dependent based on the record and evidence presented. You must also actively participate in reunification services if they are offered to you. Substantially neglecting or wilfully refusing to remedy the circumstances that cause your child to be in an out-of-home placement, including refusing to participate in reunification services, will be grounds for terminating your parental rights to your child. If you do not participate in reunification services or fail to attend further proceedings without good cause, the Court may terminate your parental rights or appoint a permanent guardian for your child. The Court will presume that you understand the contents of this notice unless you tell the Court at today's hearing that you do not understand this notice.

Next Hearing:

Date & Time:

Judicial Officer:

Judge David K. Udall

Initial Dependency Hearing
 Mediation
 Pre-Trial Conference
 Dependency Adjudication Hrg
 Disposition Hearing
 Review Hearing
 Permanency Hearing

Judge David K. Udall
 Judge David K. Udall

At Southeast Juvenile Court Building, 1810 South Lewis Street, Courtroom 6, Mesa, Arizona

My signature confirms that I have received a copy of this document on this date.

Parent Signature

Printed Name

Date

Parent Signature

Printed Name

Date

AZ-KAHRAMAN027433

Name of Person Filing:

Address:

City, State, Zip Code:

Day/Evening Telephone:

Kahraman

CLERK OF THE
SUPERIOR COURT

FILED

G. M. V. V. R. S. P.

2019 JAN 24 PM 3:44

FOR CLERK'S USE ONLY

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
IN MARICOPA COUNTY

Case Number: JD 532201

IN THE MATTER OF:

Kahraman

Title of Document:

Affidavit

 RESTRICTED

See attached document

EXHIBIT 215

BELL
8-23-24 mkm

David K. Udall
Case # JD 532206

Affidavit

Comes now Affiant, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, a living woman, Sui Juris, under Gcd and an Arizona State National. I am not a person, a resident, an entity, nor fictional corporate entity. I hereby present the following facts:

Notice of Filing in Civil Superior

A filing in civil superior was filed January 24, 2019 in the SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA, located at 201 W. Jefferson St, Phoenix, Arizona 85003. Affiant is seeking damages unless you immediately return our uniquely created biological property.

Affidavit Demanding Dismissal

HON. DAVID K. UDALL

IN THE MATTER OF:

D.K. Kemal Kahraman

F1149031

DOB: [REDACTED] 2012

K.K. Troy Kahraman

F1149032

DOB: [REDACTED] 2012

Comes now Affiant, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, a living woman, Sui Juris, and an Arizona State National, under God. I am not a person, a resident, an entity or corporate fiction. Affiant presents as Evidence of the following facts:

The use of any statutes, codes, rules, regulations, or court citations, within any document created by Me, at any time, is only to notice that which is applicable to government officials, and is not intended, nor shall it be construed, to mean that I have conferred, submitted to, or entered into any jurisdiction alluded to thereby and further.

Affiant, pursuant to The U.S. Constitution and U.S. Civil Code, objects to the Pretrial Conference, and any claims previously presented in this matter, where jurisdiction never existed; Affiant demands this case be dismissed immediately with extreme prejudice. Affiant demands the immediate return of our biological property.

1. Affiant affirms the following as truth, as per unrebutted affidavit served on Sarah Kramer, a woman acting as a case worker for Department of Child Services, and

henceforth shall be referred to as DCS. Per unrebuted affidavit, I affirm that Sarah Kramer is a private contractor of/for a private company (DCS) that is under contract for the Title IV-E funds; that she has no first-hand knowledge of any wrong done by me; that any information given by me was done under threat, duress and coercion under the guise that DCS was a government entity and not a private corporation. I do not consent to contract with private companies known as ARIZONA, Department of Economic Services or their subsidiary: Department of Child Services, nor do I accept any benefits or services. I affirm there IS NO VALID CLAIM AGAIST ME, per unrebuted affidavit. I demand the immediate return of my biological property; {See Exhibits A and B}.

2. Affiant affirms the following as truth, as per unrebuted affidavit served on Sarah Mendez, a woman acting as DCS case worker: that she is a private contractor of a private company that is under contract for the Title IV-E funds and not for wrongs; that she has no first-hand knowledge of any wrong done by me; that any information given by me was done under threat, duress and coercion under the guise that DCS was a government entity and not a private corporation. I do not consent to contract with private companies or accept any benefits or services; and I demand the immediate return of my biological property; {See Exhibits A and B}.
3. Affiant affirms, the aforementioned being entered as truth on the record, that these women, Sarah Kramer and Sarah Mendez, acting as DCS workers, infringed upon my Constitutional rights, under the Fourth Amendment: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by

oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.” On December 28, 2019, they unlawfully seized my biological property without firsthand knowledge of any wrongdoing done by myself, without a warrant, and with an unlawful Ex Parte order, {See Exhibit C} lacking live signature and the State seal. Further, Affiant was defrauded by these women, under the guise of a government agency, and the use of coercion to steal my biological property;

4. Affiant affirms, the aforementioned items 1 and 2 being entered as truth on the record, that these women, Sarah Kramer and Sarah Mendez, acting as DCS workers, infringed upon my Constitutional rights, under the Fifth Amendment: to “...be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law...” When due process is denied, jurisdiction ceases to exist. M.H. v. Jer. W., 51 So.3d 334, 337 (Ala.Civ.App.2010) (quoting Neal v. Neal, 856 So.2d 766, 781 (Ala.2002), quoting in turn Seventh Wonder v. Southbound Records, Inc., 364 So.2d 1173, 1174 (Ala.1978)) (emphasis added).
Elliot v. Piersol, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828).
Reynolds v. Volunteer State Life Ins. Co., Tex.Civ.App., 80 S.W.2d 1087, 1092.
5. Affiant further asserts conspiracy occurred, during the unlawful seizure of biological properties; according to 18 U.S. Code § 241, “If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or if two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any

right or privilege so secured— They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section **or if such acts include kidnapping** or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.”

6. Affiant also affirms due process has been violated under the color of law; according to 18 U.S. Code § 242, “Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.”
7. Affiant further believes that David K. Udall, the man acting as Judge in the above styled case, Kathleen Martoncik, the woman acting as Assistant Attorney General in the above

styled case, and all men and women of the Attorney General's Office are fictional corporate entities, and are therefore unable to hear or bring charges against Affiant, a living woman, Sui Juris, under God, and an American State National, who attended by special appearance only, as stated in the preliminary hearing.

8. Affiant further believes that Sarah Kramer, Sarah Mendez, and the men and women of the Attorney General's office, and DCS are contracted to receive Title IV funds; therefore, the Agent, Department and State are actively engaging in barratry, i.e. paid for the removal of the biological property. *State v. Batson, 17 S.E.2d 511 (N.C. 1941)*, rather than acting in the "best interest" of our biological property. {See Exhibit D}

9. Affiant further demands that if anyone can and does verify, in written affidavit under penalty of perjury, that they have first-hand knowledge the aforementioned claims are untrue, then Affiant demands the right to a trial by jury, for "In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law." There is no question the value in controversy of our biological property far, far exceeds twenty dollars.

Affiant demands this case be dismissed immediately with extreme prejudice, due to lack of jurisdiction and lack of due process, removing all authority to talk to Affiant in court. Affiant further demands the immediate return of our biological property, who were unlawfully removed from our loving care, infringing upon our constitutional rights.

Any man or woman who denies my claim is true must write an affidavit sworn under the penalty of perjury, and having first-hand knowledge of the facts. Any man or woman who makes statements without first-hand knowledge commits trespass upon the house of Kahraman. {See Exhibits A and B}

Verification

I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 23rd day of January 2019.



Jessica Mann; Kahraman

Notary

On this 23 day of Jan, 2019; before me Jessica Mann, the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living woman described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that she executed the same of her free will act and deed.



Notary

My commission expires: 1/7/22



Affidavit Demanding Dismissal

HON. DAVID K. UDALL

IN THE MATTER OF:

D.K. Kemal Kahraman

F1149031

DOB: [REDACTED] 2012

K.K. Troy Kahraman

F1149032

DOB: [REDACTED] 2012

Comes now Affiant, Ahmet; Kahraman, a living man, Sui Juris, and a resident alien, under God.

I am not a person, a resident, an entity or corporate fiction. Affiant presents as Evidence of the following facts:

The use of any statutes, codes, rules, regulations, or court citations, within any document created by Me, at any time, is only to notice that which is applicable to government officials, and is not intended, nor shall it be construed, to mean that I have conferred, submitted to, or entered into any jurisdiction alluded to thereby and further.

Affiant, pursuant to The U.S. Constitution and U.S. Civil Code, objects to the Pretrial Conference, and any claims previously presented in this matter, where jurisdiction never existed; Affiant demands this case be dismissed immediately with extreme prejudice. Affiant demands the immediate return of our biological property.

1. Affiant affirms the following as truth, as per unrebuted affidavit served on Sarah Kramer, a woman acting as a case worker for Department of Child Services, and

henceforth shall be referred to as DCS. Per unrebuted affidavit, I affirm that Sarah Kramer is a private contractor of/for a private company (DCS) that is under contract for the Title IV-E funds; that she has no first-hand knowledge of any wrong done by me; that any information given by me was done under threat, duress and coercion under the guise that DCS was a government entity and not a private corporation. I do not consent to contract with private companies known as ARIZONA, Department of Economic Services or their subsidiary: Department of Child Services, nor do I accept any benefits or services. I affirm there IS NO VALID CLAIM AGAIST ME, per unrebuted affidavit. I demand the immediate return of my biological property; {See Exhibits A and B}.

2. Affiant affirms the following as truth, as per unrebuted affidavit served on Sarah Mendez, a woman acting as DCS case worker: that she is a private contractor of a private company that is under contract for the Title IV-E funds and not for wrongs; that she has no first-hand knowledge of any wrong done by me; that any information given by me was done under threat, duress and coercion under the guise that DCS was a government entity and not a private corporation. I do not consent to contract with private companies or accept any benefits or services; and I demand the immediate return of my biological property; {See Exhibits A and B}.
3. Affiant affirms, the aforementioned being entered as truth on the record, that these women, Sarah Kramer and Sarah Mendez, acting as DCS workers, infringed upon my Constitutional rights, under the Fourth Amendment: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by

oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized." On December 28, 2019, they unlawfully seized my biological property without firsthand knowledge of any wrongdoing done by myself, without a warrant, and with an unlawful Ex Parte order, {See Exhibit C} lacking live signature and the State seal. Further, Affiant was defrauded by these women, under the guise of a government agency, and the use of coercion to steal my biological property;

4. Affiant affirms, the aforementioned items 1 and 2 being entered as truth on the record, that these women, Sarah Kramer and Sarah Mendez, acting as DCS workers, infringed upon my Constitutional rights, under the Fifth Amendment: to "...be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law..." When due process is denied, jurisdiction ceases to exist. M.H. v. Jer. W., 51 So.3d 334, 337 (Ala.Civ.App.2010) (quoting Neal v. Neal, 856 So.2d 766, 781 (Ala.2002), quoting in turn Seventh Wonder v. Southbound Records, Inc., 364 So.2d 1173, 1174 (Ala.1978)) (emphasis added). Elliot v. Piersol, 1 Pet. 328, 340, 26 U.S. 328, 340 (1828). Reynolds v. Volunteer State Life Ins. Co., Tex.Civ.App., 80 S.W.2d 1087, 1092.
5. Affiant further asserts conspiracy occurred, during the unlawful seizure of biological properties; according to 18 U.S. Code § 241, "If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same; or if two or more persons go in disguise on the highway, or on the premises of another, with intent to prevent or hinder his free exercise or enjoyment of any

right or privilege so secured— They shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, they shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.”

6. Affiant also affirms due process has been violated under the color of law; according to 18 U.S. Code § 242, “Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains, or penalties, on account of such person being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death.”

7. Affiant further believes that David K. Udall, the man acting as Judge in the above styled case, Kathleen Martoncik, the woman acting as Assistant Attorney General in the above

styled case, and all men and women of the Attorney General's Office are fictional corporate entities, and are therefore unable to hear or bring charges against Affiant, a living woman, Sui Juris, under God, and an American State National, who attended by special appearance only, as stated in the preliminary hearing.

8. Affiant further believes that Sarah Kramer, Sarah Mendez, and the men and women of the Attorney General's office, and DCS are contracted to receive Title IV funds; therefore, the Agent, Department and State are actively engaging in **barratry**, i.e. paid for the removal of the biological property. *State v. Batson, 17 S.E.2d 511 (N.C. 1941)*, rather than acting in the "best interest" of our biological property. {See Exhibit D}

9. Affiant further demands that if anyone can and does verify, in written affidavit under penalty of perjury, that they have first-hand knowledge the aforementioned claims are untrue, then Affiant demands the right to a trial by jury, for "In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law." There is no question the value in controversy of our biological property far, far exceeds twenty dollars.


Affiant demands this case be dismissed immediately with extreme prejudice, due to lack of jurisdiction and lack of due process, removing all authority to talk to Affiant in court. Affiant further demands the immediate return of our biological property, who were unlawfully removed from our loving care, infringing upon our constitutional rights.

Any man or woman who denies my claim is true must write an affidavit sworn under the penalty of perjury, and having first-hand knowledge of the facts. Any man or woman who makes statements without first-hand knowledge commits trespass upon the house of Kahraman. {See Exhibits A and B}

Verification


I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 23 day of January 20 19.



Ahmet; Kahraman

Notary

On this 23 day of Jan, 20 19; before me Ahmet Kahraman, the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living man described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that he executed the same of his free will act and deed.


Notary

My commission expires: 1/7/22



CT00200 (9/14)

ADDENDUM REPORT TO JUVENILE COURT**Court Case Number** JD532206**Date of Report** 01/25/2019**Case Name** KAHRAMAN, JESSICA ID: 608484**A. Name and Date of Birth for Each Child Subject to This Court Case Number:**

3874373 KAHRAMAN, DYLAN	DOB: 09/27/2012
3874372 KAHRAMAN, KENAN	DOB: 09/27/2012

B. Child or Children Subject to This Report If Different From Above.


N/A

I. PRESENT SITUATION:

Since the last court hearing on 01/09/2019, Dylan and Kenan Kahraman have been residing together in a licensed DDD foster home. Dylan and Kenan are doing well in the home, where they share a room. Dylan and Kenan enjoy sharing a room but do enjoy having their own time.

At the foster home, Kenan walks independently around the home and up and down the stairs without assistance. Kenan enjoys doing things independently and does not like to get assistance from anyone. Kenan enjoys music and dance and it is used as an encouragement to walk independently. At school, Kenan walks independently in the classroom and the other classrooms. The only time that Kenan uses a wheelchair at school is to go to the cafeteria for lunch, as it is on the opposite side of the school and the other children in his class run to the cafeteria and Kenan is not able to keep up at this time. Kenan's teacher reports that he is doing fantastic in the classroom and is on target academically. Kenan has made friends and enjoys telling jokes to his friends. When Kenan first arrived at the foster home, he was hesitant to try new foods, however now Kenan has not hesitations and eats any food that he is offered. There have been no reactions to any foods that he eats. Kenan attended a cardiologist appointment on 01/24/2019. Dr. Miga reports "His right ventricular heart failure has resolved. This is a very rapid response to therapy and somewhat atypical and supports a diagnosis of secondary pulmonary hypertension and not a primary pulmonary hypertension. The exact etiology is unclear but may very likely be related to his nutritional status."

At the foster home, Dylan tends to crawl or scoot around the home, however will walk with the encouragement of foster mother, however not for long periods of time. Dylan has attended the pediatrician, and there is no reason that Dylan cannot walk independently except for the fact that Dylan does not believe that he can. With positive reinforcement and encouragement, Dylan will walk and does so without issue. At school, Dylan does not use a wheelchair, however does use a walker as support throughout the day. Dylan's teacher reports that he is doing fantastic in school and is well above academically compared to his classmates. She reports Dylan as being very social and excited to learn new things in class. He has made many new friends who want to sit by him in class and in the classroom. His teacher reports that he is thriving in the classroom. Dylan eats a regular diet in the foster home and there have been no reactions to any of the foods offered.



Jessica and Ahmet Kahraman have been provided therapeutic visitation through Southwest Human Development. Visitation supervisor, Carla White, has been attempting to reach out to Mr. and Mrs. Kahraman to schedule the intake for visitation and create a visitation schedule, however Mrs. Kahraman has reported "We do not agree to the terms and conditions of your services, and are not contracting. We do not consent. We demand the immediate return of our biological property."

At this time, it is respectfully recommended that Dylan and Kenan Kahraman remain in out of home care due to the lack of engagement in services by Mrs. and Mr. Kahraman. Mrs. and Mr. Kahraman are encouraged to engage in therapeutic visitation with Southwest Human Development.

II. RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. DCS:

It is respectfully recommended that Dylan and Kenan Kahraman remain a ward(s) of the court, committed to the care, custody and control of the Arizona Department of Child Safety.

B. FINANCIAL:

It is respectfully recommended that beginning (date) _____, the parents listed below be assessed the following amounts on a monthly basis per child as the contribution towards the cost of foster care:

(parent name) _____ be assessed \$ _____ monthly for each of the following children: _____

(parent name) _____ be assessed \$ _____ monthly for each of the following children: _____

(parent name) _____ be assessed \$ _____ monthly for each of the following children: _____

(parent name) _____ be assessed \$ _____ monthly for each of the following children: _____

(parent name) _____ be assessed \$ _____ monthly for each of the following children: _____

C. REASONABLE EFFORTS FINDINGS:

It is respectfully recommended that the Court find that the Arizona Department of Child Safety has made reasonable efforts in this case.

Page 3 Addendum Report To Juvenile Court

Respectfully Submitted:



Name/Title: Madison Bell DCS Safety Specialist

DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SAFETY

Telephone Number: 480-656-9306

Date: 01/25/2019

Approved by:



Name/Title: Mecca Temple DCS Unit Supervisor

DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SAFETY

Telephone Number: 480-656-9427

Date: 01/25/2019

Case Name: KAHRAMAN, JESSICAID: 608484



Clerk of the Superior Court
*** Electronically Filed ***
1/31/2019 8:00 AM

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

1/29/2019

HON. DAVID K. UDALL

CLERK OF THE COURT

C. Gerhardt
Deputy

IN THE MATTER OF:

DYLAN KEMAL KAHRAMAN

MEGAN J HAYWOOD

F1149031

DOB: 9/27/2012

KENAN TROY KAHRAMAN

F1149032

DOB: 9/27/2012

KATHLEEN MARTONCIK

JESSICA WREN KAHRAMAN

1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95

MESA AZ 85202

AHMET KAHRAMAN

1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95

MESA AZ 85202

FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD

DCS SPECIALIST - CENTRAL REGION

PRETRIAL CONFERENCE HEARING
CONTESTED DEPENDENCY HEARING SET

9:01 a.m. This matter is digitally recorded in Courtroom 6.

This is the time set for Pretrial Conference on a petition filed 1/3/2019 regarding the mother, Jessica Kahraman, and the father, Ahmet Kahraman.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

1/29/2019

Present: Kathleen Martoncik, Assistant Attorney General; Madison Bell, DCS Child Safety Specialist; Jessica Kahraman, mother; Ahmet Kahraman, father; Megan Haywood, guardian ad litem for the children; Christina Lawler, Jeannette Lawler, Sandy Miller; Elise Melvin; and Victoria Houle.

The mother, Jessica Kahraman, hands the Assistant Attorney General a document which appears to be a civil lawsuit that she has filed against the Assistant Attorney General, the Court, and several other individuals. The Assistant Attorney General notes this is not proper notice.

The mother, Jessica Kahraman, requests a dismissal with extreme prejudice and demands immediate return of her biological property.

The father, Ahmet Kahraman, demands immediate return of his biological property.

The parties indicate to the Court they anticipate it will take approximately three half-days for trial, over objection of the mother, Jessica Kahraman, and the father, Ahmet Kahraman.

Megan Haywood request the Court reconsider appointing the parents advisory counsel.

The mother, Jessica Kahraman, objects and indicates she is Sui Juris and will not take advisory counsel.

The father, Ahmet Kahraman, indicates he is Suri Juris.

IT IS ORDERED setting this matter for Dependency Adjudication regarding the mother, Jessica Kahraman, and the father, Ahmet Kahraman,

on 6/03/2019
at 1:30 PM to 4:30 PM
before Honorable David K. Udall
at the Maricopa County Juvenile Court Center
Southeast Facility, 1810 S. Lewis St., Mesa, AZ 85210

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

1/29/2019

IT IS ORDERED setting this matter for Dependency Adjudication regarding the mother, Jessica Kahraman, and the father, Ahmet Kahraman,

on 6/04/2019
at 1:30 PM to 4:30 PM
before Honorable David K. Udall
at the Maricopa County Juvenile Court Center
Southeast Facility, 1810 S. Lewis St., Mesa, AZ 85210

IT IS ORDERED setting this matter for Dependency Adjudication regarding the mother, Jessica Kahraman, and the father, Ahmet Kahraman,

on 6/06/2019
at 1:30 PM to 4:30 PM
before Honorable David K. Udall
at the Maricopa County Juvenile Court Center
Southeast Facility, 1810 S. Lewis St., Mesa, AZ 85210

The Court urges counsel and the parties to meet and confer in an effort to resolve the issues in dispute without the need for the above contested hearing.

9:06 a.m. Court adjourns.

This Courtroom utilizes an electronic recording system for the Court's record. If a court reporter is needed, a written request must be filed with the Clerk of the Court and a copy provided to the assigned judicial officer at least 72 hours before the commencement of the proceeding.

To order a copy of the audio record on compact disc (CD), please call Juvenile Court Administration (Durango facility - 602-506-4533/Southeast facility - 602-506-2544). There will be a fee of \$30 for each copy of the Superior Court proceedings. All copies will be provided using Court-supplied media.

Filed: Verification

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

1/29/2019

WARNING

As a parent, it is your responsibility to cooperate with all services offered, and work toward return of your children. A failure to do so, within a reasonable period of time, may mean losing your children forever through termination of your rights and adoption.

CLERK OF THE
SUPERIOR COURT
FILED

DEP

Samantha Jep
2019 JAN 31 PM 12:56

Name of Person Filing:
Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Day/Evening Telephone:

JESSICA KAHRAMAN
/

FOR CLERK'S USE ONLY

**SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
IN MARICOPA COUNTY**

Case Number: JD5322DV

IN THE MATTER OF:

Kahraman

Title of Document:

ATTENDIT RESTRICTED

See attached document



Affidavit of Trespass Upon My Property

Comes now Affiant, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, a living woman, Sui Juris, and an Arizona State National, under God. I am not a person, a resident, an entity or corporate fiction. Affiant, in this Court of Record, claims the following:

1. I claim that multiple men and women actors are attempting to use a private court to trespass upon my property by way of theft;
2. I require the immediate return of my biological property (See exhibit A and B);
3. I claim that I do not wish to be trafficked into your private Associations'/Organizations' affairs;
4. I claim that this private court has a contract for title IV-E funds and has no right to my biological property under the common law;
5. I require any man or woman who is attempting to administrate my biological property to present a claim under the common law that he or she has right to my property;
6. If no man can come forth with a claim under the common law within 72 hours, I require my property to be returned immediately;
7. I claim that this Court of Record moves only by the common law; if no man or woman rebuts this affidavit, point by point, under penalty of perjury, in the form of an affidavit, said biological property is to be returned within 3 days;

Verification

I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing

Exhibit A




Exhibit B



representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.


Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 31st day of January 2019.



Jessica Mann; Kahraman

Notary

On this 31 day of January, 2019; before me Jessica Mann Kahraman, the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living woman described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that she executed the same of her free will act and deed.



Notary

My commission expires: 11/8/2020



Clerk of the Superior Court
*** Electronically Filed ***
T. Knight, Deputy
2/5/2019 8:00:00 AM
Filing ID 10125532

DISTRIBUTION NOTICE FOR: ORDSEAL - ORDER SEALING COURT RECORD (FILED 2/1/2019) -
DOCKET ID: 162283461

CASE NO: JD532206

CASE NAME: DYLAN KEMAL KAHRAMAN
KENAN TROY KAHRAMAN

ENDORSEMENTS:

LISA BODDINGTON

MEGAN J HAYWOOD

JESSICA WREN KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA, AZ 85202

AHMET KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA, AZ 85202

DCS SPECIALIST - CENTRAL REGION

FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD

JUVENILE COURT ADMINISTRATION - SE

NOTDJSJJD



1 MARK BRNOVICH
2 Attorney General

CLERK OF THE
SUPERIOR COURT
FILED
S. Mohammed REP
2019 FEB - 1 PM 4:19

3 LISA C. BODDINGTON
4 Assistant Attorney General
5 State Bar No. 028217
6 KATHLEEN E. MARTONCIK
7 Assistant Attorney General
8 State Bar No. 023982
9 CFP/PSS
10 120 W. 1st Avenue, 2nd Floor
11 Mesa, Arizona 85210
12 Telephone: (602) 771-4000
13 PSSSef@azago

14 Attorneys for the Department of Child Safety

15 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

16 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

17 In the Matter of:

No. JD532206

18 DYLAN KEMAL KAHRAMAN
d.o.b. 09/27/2012
KENAN TROY KAHRAMAN
d.o.b. [REDACTED] 2012

RECOMMENDATION TO SEAL
CV2019-091255

19 Person(s) under 18 years of age.

(Honorable David Udall)

20 Upon motion of the Department of Child Safety, and good cause appearing, this
21 Court is issuing a recommendation that CV2019-091255 be sealed for the purpose of
22 protecting the privacy of the above-captioned children who are currently wards of this
23 Court.

24 DATED: _____

25 February 1, 2019.

26
27
28 Subhloow
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

Clerk of the Superior Court
*** Electronically Filed ***
T. Knight, Deputy
2/5/2019 8:00:00 AM
Filing ID 10125511

DISTRIBUTION NOTICE FOR: ORD - ORDER (FILED 2/1/2019) - DOCKET ID: 162283439

CASE NO: JF 532406

CASE NAME: DYLAN KEMAL KAHRAMAN
KENAN TROY KAHRAMAN

ENDORSEMENTS:

LISA BODDINGTON

MEGAN J HAYWOOD

JESSICA WREN KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA, AZ 85202

AHMET KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA, AZ 85202

DCS SPECIALIST - CENTRAL REGION

FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD

JUVENILE COURT ADMINISTRATION - SE

NOTDISTJD

1. MARK BRNOVICH
2. Attorney General
3. LISA C. BODDINGTON
4. Assistant Attorney General
State Bar No. 028217
5. KATHLEEN E. MARTONCIK
6. Assistant Attorney General
State Bar No. 023982
7. CFR/PSS
8. 120 W. 1st Avenue, 2nd Floor
Mesa, Arizona 85210
9. Telephone: (602) 771-4000
10. PSSSef@azag.gov

CLERK OF THE
SUPERIOR COURT
FILED
S. Mohammed DEP
2019 FEB - 1 PM 4: 18
Contract

11. Attorneys for the Department of Child Safety

12. IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

13. IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

14. In the Matter of:

15. No. JD532206

16. DYLAN KEMAL KAHRAMAN
d.o.b. 09/27/2012
17. KENAN TROY KAHRAMAN
d.o.b. 09/27/2012

18. ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

19. Person(s) under 18 years of age.

20. (Honorable David Udall)

21. Upon motion of the Department of Child Safety, and good cause appearing,

22. IT IS ORDERED that Mother, Jessica Wren Kahraman A.K.A. Jessica W. Mann,

23. and Father, Ahmet Kahraman, appear and present evidence as to why they have violated

24. the following Court orders: (1) the Court's January 9, 2019 orders to remove on-line

25. information posted about this case; and (2) the Court's January 9, 2019 orders regarding

26. continuing to reveal confidential information about this case and the children subject to

27. it.

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED setting a hearing on the Order to Show Cause for
2 Feb. 13, 2019 at 1:30 PM for one hour.

3 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the above-listed hearing shall also be set as a
4 status conference for the purpose of discussing discovery in this matter.

5 DATED: February 1, 2019.

6
7
8
9 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Name of Person Filing:
Address:
City, State, Zip Code:
Day/Evening Telephone:

Jessica Manz Kahraman

CLERK OF THE
SUPERIOR COURT
FILED
S. MAGAVERA DEP
2019 FEB -5 PM 1:17
FOR CLERK'S USE ONLY

**SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
IN MARICOPA COUNTY**

IN THE MATTER OF:

Case Number: JD532206

Title of Document:

Affidavit

RESTRICTED

See attached document



Affidavit Requiring Authority to Act


I, Affiant and one of the people, Sui Juris, do claim the following:

1. I claim, as a woman and one of the people, that I have the right to associate and assemble;
2. I claim that Kathleen Martoncik, a woman acting as the Assistant Attorney General, is working in a private capacity for a private corporation, on retainer with Department of Child Safety, who is in contract for Title IV-E funds;
3. I require Kathleen to show the findings of fact and conclusions of law that allow for a corporation to sue a woman, with no injured party; If she feels she has the ability, please tell where this is found under common law;
4. I require, in this court of record, for Kathleen, or anyone else who is acting for Title IV-E funds, to show where I have caused him/her wrong or harm;
5. I require Kathleen to show proof, in a sworn affidavit under penalty of perjury, that she has authority to act as "Assistant Attorney General" and represent the men and women of DCS in bringing claim against me, when this authority cannot be delegated. "A delegate cannot delegate; an agent cannot delegate his functions to a subagent without the knowledge or consent of the principal; the person to whom an office or duty is delegated cannot lawfully devolve the duty on another, unless he be expressly authorized to do so." Coke, 77; Broom, Max. 840; 2 Kent, Comm. 633; 2 Steph. Comm. 119 "A delegated power cannot be again delegated." 2 Inst. 597; Black's, 2d. 347; 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1300 "A deputy cannot have (or appoint) a deputy." Story, Ag. s.13; 9 Coke, 77; 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1936;
6. If any man or woman administrates my property without my consent, he/she agrees to have all affidavits presented for publication on public record. Further, he/she will be responsible, in the proper name of the man or woman who is taking part in withholding my biological property from me, for paying \$5,000 per day per biological property until they are returned.

Verification

I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.


Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 5th day of February 20 19.



Jessica Mann; Kahraman

Notary

On this 5th day of Feb , 20 19 ; before me Jessica Mann Kahraman the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living woman described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that she executed the same of her free will act and deed.



Notary

My commission expires: NOV 4, 2021



CLERK OF THE
SUPERIOR COURT
FILED

S. Mohammad DEP
2019 FEB 12 PM 3:52

Attn: Jennifer E. Green
Re: JD532206



Affidavit


Comes now Affiant, Jessica Mann; Kahraman, a living woman, Presenting as Evidence of the following facts:

1. I do believe this woman, Jennifer E. Green, a woman acting as Judge, is a private contractor of a private company that is under contract for the Title IV-E funds and not for wrongs;
2. I require this woman, Jennifer E. Green, to swear under the penalty of perjury that there exists, a sworn statement by a man or woman with first-hand knowledge of any wrong done by me;
3. I require this woman, Jennifer E. Green, to swear under penalty of perjury that there exists, a warrant for the removal of my biological property, executed on or before December 28, 2018, and that there exists, a properly executed court order, with State seal and wet ink signature, for the removal of my biological property, executed on or before December 28, 2018. I require this woman to present both for publication upon the Court of Record;
4. I require this woman, Jennifer E. Green, to show the findings of fact and conclusions of law that allow for a corporation to sue a woman, with no injured party; If she feels she has the ability, please tell where this is found under common law;
5. I require this woman, Jennifer E. Green, to swear under penalty of perjury, that she upholds her sworn Oath of Office upon the Constitution in this private court; if she does not, I require that she recuse herself from this case;
6. I do not wish to work with private companies or accept any benefits or services;

Exhibit A



Exhibit B




7. I claim there has never been any abuse or neglect of my biological property; {See Exhibits A and B}
8. If this woman, Jennifer E. Green, believes my claim is not true, she must make a claim in the form of an affidavit under oath or affirmation and under the penalty of perjury within seven days. Any failure to do so will be considered a trespass and I will charge \$5,000 a day per biological property to be paid immediately; {See Exhibits A and B}

Verification

I hereby declare, certify and state, pursuant to the penalties of perjury under the laws of the United States, and by the provisions of 28 USC § 174 that all of the above and foregoing representations are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.


Executed in Mesa, Arizona this 12th day of February 2019.



Jessica Mann; Kahraman


Notary

On this 12 day of Feb, 2019; before me Jessica Mann Kahraman, the subscriber, affiant, personally appeared to me known to be the living woman described in and who executed the foregoing instrument and swore before me that she executed the same of her free will act and deed.



Notary

My commission expires: 7-25-2022



SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

Clerk of the Superior Court

*** Filed ***

8:00 AM

2/14/2019

JD532206

2/12/2019

HONORABLE JENNIFER E. GREEN

CLERK OF THE COURT

P. Bryant
Deputy

IN THE MATTER OF:

D.K. KAHRAMAN
F1149031
DOB: 9/27/2012
K.K. KAHRAMAN
F1149032
DOB: 9/27/2012

MEGAN J HAYWOOD

LISA BODDINGTON

JESSICA WREN KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA AZ 85202

AHMET KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA AZ 85202

FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD
DCS SPECIALIST - CENTRAL REGION

MINUTE ENTRY

The court will address two pleadings and a series of twelve affidavits that were recently filed by Mother and/or came to the court's attention:

1. "Your offer is contract is NOT accepted," and email sent to Judge Udall's Judicial Assistant and the Assigned Assistant Attorney General on February 8, 2019

The court is in receipt of several pages emailed to the prior assigned division's Judicial Assistant wherein a person has written in marker "your offer to contract is NOT accepted." First,

**SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY**

JD532206

2/12/2019

the court is unsure of the meaning of this language, as this is a juvenile dependency case involving two children and is not a contract case. Second, the pleading does not conform to Rule 46 of the Arizona Rules of Juvenile Court for several reasons, which requires, in part, to seek all other parties' positions on any motion and to serve all parties.

The juvenile court is not in the business of "contracting with" litigants.

The court will take no action on the documents emailed to the prior assigned division's Judicial Assistant, but will file them along with this order.

2. "Request to the Court," filed February 4, 2019

The court received a pleading from Mother, who refers to herself as "Ms. Mann; Kahraman," entitled "Request to the Court, filed February 4, 2019. Mother first noted "I am a living woman, under God. I am sui juris and an Arizona State National." The court finds this is a statement that requires the court to take no action. Second, Mother asked the court to provide her with an audio recording of the pretrial conference. All litigants may request an audio record of court proceedings as directed at the bottom of all minute entries to Juvenile Court Administration. For the Southeast Facility, the number is 602 506-2544, and there is a \$30 fee per requested audio recording.

3. Twelve Affidavits filed from January 9, 2019 to February 5, 2019

The court has received twelve affidavits from Mother filed from January 9, 2019 until February 5, 2019. The affidavits contain statements by Mother, but do not properly request relief from the court. The affidavits appear to set forth Mother's frustrations with the juvenile dependency process, including actions taken by the court and the Department of Child Safety.

For example, the court received a document entitled "Affidavit Requiring Authority to Act," filed February 5, 2019. The affidavit appears to be a request for the assigned Assistant Attorney General [Kathleen Martoncik] to "show findings of fact and conclusions of law that allow for a corporation to sue a woman." The affidavit also asks Ms. Martoncik to "show where [Mother has] caused him/her wrong or harm." First, as previously noted, this is a juvenile dependency case and there is no relevant legal authority for Ms. Martoncik to "show" "findings of fact and conclusions of law." Second, the Department served Mother a copy of the Dependency Petition in court on January 9, 2019. Mother is on notice as to the allegations contained in the petition. Mother's pleading does not conform to Rule 46 of the Arizona Rules of Juvenile Court for several reasons, which requires, in part, for a party to seek all other parties' positions on any motion and to serve all parties.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

2/12/2019

To the extent the affidavits seek relief from the court, they are denied because they are not motions properly filed pursuant to Rule 46 of the Arizona Rules of Juvenile Court.

To the extent that any of the above pleadings sought relief from this court,

IT IS ORDERED denying these pleadings for the reasons set forth above.

Filed:

Emailed Documents

This Courtroom utilizes an electronic recording system for the Court's record. If a court reporter is needed, a written request must be filed with the Clerk of the Court and a copy provided to the assigned judicial officer at least 72 hours before the commencement of the proceeding.

To order a copy of the audio record on compact disc (CD), please call Juvenile Court Administration (Durango facility - 602-506-4533/Southeast facility - 602-506-2544). There will be a fee of \$30 for each copy of the Superior Court proceedings. All copies will be provided using Court-supplied media.

February 12, 2019
DATE

Jennifer Green
HONORABLE JENNIFER E. GREEN



SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

Clerk of the Superior Court

*** Filed ***

2/21/2019 8:00 AM

2/21/2019

JD532206

2/13/2019

CLERK OF THE COURT

HONORABLE JENNIFER E. GREEN

P. Bryant
Deputy

IN THE MATTER OF:

DYLAN KEMAL KAHRAMAN
F1149031

DOB: 9/27/2012

KENAN TROY KAHRAMAN

F1149032

DOB: 9/27/2012

MEGAN J HAYWOOD

LISA BODDINGTON

JESSICA WREN KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA AZ 85202

AHMET KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA AZ 85202

FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD
DCS SPECIALIST - CENTRAL REGION

EVIDENTIARY HEARING – NON DELIQUENCY

Prior to the hearing commencing, Petitioner's Exhibits 1 through 20 are marked for identification.

1:31 p.m. This matter is digitally recorded in Courtroom 3.

This is the time set for Evidentiary Hearing regarding an Order to Show Cause filed 2/1/2019.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

2/13/2019

Present: Assistant Attorney General Katie Martoncik; Madiason Bell, DCS child safety specialist; Mother, Jessica Kahraman, representing herself; Father Ahmet Kahraman, representing himself; family support; and other parties, observing.

IT IS ORDERED the parties are not permitted to make any recordings or take any pictures during this proceeding.

The parties are advised, if a recording of this proceeding is requested, instructions for ordering a copy are provided at the end of this minute entry, and the other minute entries they have received.

Madison Bell is sworn and testifies.

The court will take judicial notice of Judge Udall's minute entry dated January 9, 2019.

Petitioner's Exhibit 1 is admitted into evidence.

Petitioner's Exhibit 2 is admitted into evidence.

Petitioner's Exhibit 3 is admitted into evidence.

Petitioner's Exhibit 4 is admitted into evidence.

Petitioner's Exhibit 5 is admitted into evidence.

Petitioner's Exhibit 6 is admitted into evidence.

Petitioner's Exhibit 7 is admitted into evidence.

Petitioner's Exhibit 8 is admitted into evidence.

Petitioner's Exhibit 9 is admitted into evidence as to the photos only and not as to the accuracy of the translation.

Petitioner's Exhibit 10 is admitted into evidence.

Petitioner's Exhibit 11 is admitted into evidence.

A video clip is played for the court.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

2/13/2019

The video clip is identified as Petitioner's Exhibit 21 (time stamp 7:10 to 9:25) and admitted into evidence. Petitioner's Exhibit 21 will be marked for identification for the court upon receipt.

Petitioner's Exhibit 12 is admitted into evidence.

Petitioner's Exhibit 13 is admitted into evidence.

A video clip is played for the court.

The video clip is identified as Petitioner's Exhibit 22 (time stamp 3:44 to 4:30) and admitted into evidence. Petitioner's Exhibit 22 will be marked for identification for the court upon receipt.

The witness is excused and remains in the courtroom.

Jessica Kahraman is sworn.

The witness does not testify.

The parents make a statement on the record.

The court agrees that it must operate within the parameters of both the United States Constitution and the Arizona Constitution.

THE COURT FINDS the statutes and the laws of Arizona specifically grant this court jurisdiction to preside over dependency proceedings.

The court rejects Mother's argument that this court lacks jurisdiction for the reasons stated on the record.

2:19 p.m. The court stands in recess to review the evidence presented.

2:21 p.m. Court resumes.

All previously present parties are still present.

Based on the matters presented and for the reasons stated on the record,

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

2/13/2019

THE COURT FINDS the Department sustained its burden regarding contempt.

THE COURT FINDS the parents are in contempt of court for failing to take down the personal identifying information from the internet, including social media, about the children and about this case.

The court has reviewed A.R.S. § 8-542 and § 8-807.

THE COURT FINDS it is unlawful under Title 8 to knowingly disclose information involved in any dependency proceeding.

THE COURT FINDS Mother is in contempt of court.

THE COURT FINDS Father is in contempt of court.

LET THE RECORD REFLECT Judge Udall's order stated that the parents were ordered to have their friends and associates to take down information that they may have posted.

The court discusses what sanctions should be put in place in regards to the parents' contempt.

The court will require the Department to continue to compile discovery in the case.

IT IS ORDERED the Department will not be allowed to distribute any discovery that contains identifying information about the children, such as visitation notes, medical records, and/or pictures to the parents until they comply with the court's order.

IT IS ORDERED directing the parents to purge the confidential identifying information about the children and this case from the internet, including from their social media.

The parents are directed to take down all the information about this dependency case in the following locations: each parents' Facebook page, Sandy Miller's Facebook page, the GoFundMe page referencing the children, nourishing plot.com, Breeauna Sagdal's Facebook page, Punished for Protecting, ABDpost.com, Health Impact News, Twins Kidnapped in Arizona, and anything else on the internet related to this case.

IT IS ORDERED directing the Department to compile a list of all sites referenced so the parents understand what their obligation is to purge the contempt.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

2/13/2019

IT IS ORDERED directing the parents to demonstrate to the Department that they have scrubbed the information about this case from their own Facebook pages and contacted the owners of the identified websites to take down the confidential identifying information about the children from the internet.

IT IS ORDERED once the parents have complied with the court's order, the Department will then release additional disclosure to the parents.

LET THE RECORD REFLECT that anything that personally identifies the children as being a part of this dependency proceeding from December 17, 2018, forward, needs to be deleted pursuant to Judge Udall's order dated January 9, 2019.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED the parties may not transfer ownership of any websites to avoid complying with Judge Udall's order.

The Department requests that a third party handle disclosure in this matter.

The Department further requests that the parents be appointed advisory counsel.

The court will allow the parents to continue to represent themselves in this matter.

The court will allow the parties to brief the issue regarding whether a third party should handle disclosure in this matter, which would allow the parents to view, but not disseminate, any discovery.

Any briefing presented to the court regarding allowing a third party to handle disclosure will be no longer than three pages long, and will be due no later than, February 27, 2019.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that there is a continuing obligation to keep all information about this matter confidential.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

2/13/2019

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED setting this matter for Dependency - Adjudication regarding Mother Jessica Kahraman and Father Ahmet Kahraman

on 8/12/2019 at 1:30 PM
and 8/13/2019 at 1:30 PM
and 8/14/2019 at 1:30 PM
before Honorable Jennifer E. Green
at the Maricopa County Juvenile Court Center
Southeast Facility, 1810 S. Lewis St., Mesa, AZ 85210

This Courtroom utilizes an electronic recording system for the Court's record. If a court reporter is needed, a written request must be filed with the Clerk of the Court and a copy provided to the assigned judicial officer at least 72 hours before the commencement of the proceeding.

To order a copy of the audio record on compact disc (CD), please call Juvenile Court Administration (Durango facility - 602-506-4533/Southeast facility - 602-506-2544). There will be a fee of \$30 for each copy of the Superior Court proceedings. All copies will be provided using Court-supplied media.

2:49 p.m. Court adjourns.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

2/13/2019

LATER:

IT IS ORDERED vacating the Status Conference regarding setting new trial dates
on 2/28/2019
at 11:00 AM
before Honorable Jennifer E. Green

Petitioner's Exhibits 14 through 20 are permanently released back to Petitioner.

Petitioner's Exhibits 21 and 22 are marked for identification and added to the existing Exhibits.

February 20, 2019
DATE

Jennifer E. Green
HONORABLE JENNIFER E. GREEN



Clerk of the Superior Court

*** Filed ***

8:00 AM

FEB 28 2019

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

2/22/2019

CLERK OF THE COURT

HONORABLE JENNIFER E. GREEN

K. Scanlon

Deputy

IN THE MATTER OF:

DYLAN KEMAL KAHRAMAN
F1149031

DOB: 9/27/2012

KENAN TROY KAHRAMAN
F1149032
DOB: 9/27/2012

MEGAN J HAYWOOD

GREGORY DOUGLAS COORDES

JESSICA WREN KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA AZ 85202

AHMET KAHRAMAN
1718 S LONGMORE UNIT 95
MESA AZ 85202

DCS SPECIALIST - CENTRAL REGION

ORDER

The court is in receipt of a pleading entitled "Affidavit," filed February 12, 2019. Consistent with the court's previous denial of pleadings like this as set forth in the court's minute entry, dated February 12, 2019, the court finds as follows:

- 1) that the pleading is a series of statements or demands from Mother and does not properly request relief from the court; and
- 2) the pleading does not properly conform to Rule 46 of the Arizona Rules of Juvenile Court for several reasons, including that it did not seek other parties' positions on any motion and was not properly served to other parties.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

JD532206

2/22/2019

The court further notes that Mother demanded the court “make a claim in the form of an affidavit” . . . and “[a]ny failure to do so will be considered a trespass and I will charge \$5,000 a day per biological property to be paid immediately.” (Affidavit at 3.) The court has never entertained such an order in juvenile or family court, and there was no authority cited for the proposition.

Accordingly, to the extent that the pleading sought relief from the court,

IT IS ORDERED denying any relief sought by Mother’s Affidavit, filed February 12, 2019.

February 26, 2019
DATE

Jennifer E. Green
HONORABLE JENNIFER E. GREEN

**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Review Information

Presiding Juvenile Court Judge: Timothy J Ryan

Judge: Jennifer Green

County: Maricopa

FCRB Review Date: 05-07-2019

Court Hearing Date: 08-12-2019

Board #: MC28

FCRB Case Name: Kahraman

Program Specialist: Ashley

Next Review Date: 11-05-2019

CLERK'S OFFICE OF THE
SUPERIOR COURT
FILED
2019 MAY 22 PM 12:46
SHERIFF
D.E.P.

Child Information

Name:	Kenan Kahraman	Birth Date:	09-27-2012
Initial Placement Date:	12-28-2018	Age:	6
Current Placement Date:	01-11-2019	JD Number:	532206
Permanent Plan:	Return to parent	Legal Status:	Temporary Ward
Name:	Dylan Kahraman	Birth Date:	09-27-2012
Initial Placement Date:	12-28-2018	Age:	6
Current Placement Date:	01-11-2019	JD Number:	532206
Permanent Plan:	Return to parent	Legal Status:	Temporary Ward



**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Reasonable efforts, or active efforts in an ICWA case, were made to prevent the removal of the child(ren) from the home and that continuation therein would be contrary to the welfare of the child(ren).

Yes

Finding Comments:

None

2. The Board makes a determination that continuation of the child(ren) in out-of-home placement is necessary.

Yes

Finding Comments:

None

3. The Board makes a determination that the placement(s) is/are safe, appropriate and least restrictive.

Yes

Finding Comments:

None

- 4a . The Board makes a determination that there is an appropriate permanency goal for each child.

Yes

Finding Comments:

None

- 4b. The Board makes a determination that there is appropriate written documentation, which outlines tasks for each participant.

Yes

Finding Comments:

None

5. The Board makes a determination that each case participant is following the tasks outlined in the case plan.

Yes

**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Finding Comments:

None

6. The Board makes a determination that progress is being made toward establishing permanency for the child(ren).

Yes

Finding Comments:

None

7. At the time of the review, the Board makes a determination that the established target date for the completion of the permanency goal is **REALISTIC**.

No

Dylan
Kenan

The Agency's established target date is unrealistic for the needs of the child and/or family.

Finding Comments:

None

8. The Board recommends that a judicial determination be made that reasonable efforts, or active efforts in an ICWA case, are being made by the Agency to implement the permanency plan for the child(ren).

Yes

Finding Comments:

None

9. The child(ren)'s education and/or services to address developmental needs are being implemented successfully.

Yes

Finding Comments:

None

10. The Board makes a determination that there are significant service gaps or system problems.

No

Finding Comments:

None

**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Reports Considered:

Initial Report, 1/8/19; Addendum Report, 1/25/19; Case Plan, 1/11/19; Court Minute Entries, 3/26/19, 2/28/19; Court Orders, 3/28/19, 3/28/19, 2/22/19; Dependency Petition, 1/3/19

Parties Present at Review:

Parent, Mother, Biological for Dylan, Kenan
Madison Bell, Case Manager for Dylan, Kenan

According To:

Parent

Biological Mother

1. She's thrilled that the children have expanded their diet.
2. She couldn't identify an in-person nutrition class; therefore, the biological father completed two online classes and she's completed one.
3. The class she participated in was a basic nutrition class.
4. She's excited to be able to travel with the children and not have to prepare food, since they've expanded their diets.
5. The biological father has completed four parenting classes and she's completed eight or nine classes.
6. She's taken a variety of parenting classes.
7. She attended the psychological evaluation appointment.
8. She started therapy last week and has another session tomorrow, May 8, 2019.
9. She and the biological father are cooperating with the department so that reunification can occur.
10. She and the biological father are fully confident that Kenan and Dylan can eat an expanded diet.
11. She's identified a local registered dietitian, if the children need to be seen after reunification.
12. The dietitian provided her with dietary guidelines that helped her develop a menu for the boys. She's shared the menu with the team.
13. Visits are going well.
14. The maternal grandparents have requested visits the children.
15. She and the biological father visit the children twice a week for two hours.
16. The parent aide has provided valuable feedback.
17. The maternal grandparents visit the children twice a month.
18. She's requesting further genetic testing, as previously recommended.
19. She's not noticed a difference in the children's growth since their removal, which remains a concern.

Madison Bell

Case Manager

1. Kenan has been seen by the cardiologist for follow-up two to three times. The cardiologist no longer has concerns and Kenan no longer requires oxygen.
2. Kenan's congestive heart failure has resolved itself, which is a result of changes in his diet and nutritional status.
3. The cardiologist is happy with Kenan's progress.
4. Kenan now requires follow up appointments every three to four months.

**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

5. All medical and appointments are up-to date.
6. The biological parents do not want the children immunized; therefore, the department is respecting their wishes.
7. The boys are now walking independently.
8. The boys love to run and be active.
9. The biological parents have requested the children be evaluated by a neurologist, due to mold in their home. To the department's knowledge, mold was discovered in the home a year ago, and the children's pediatrician has not noted any issues.
10. Dylan is more social than Kenan; however, neither child is having issues making friends.
11. The boys talk highly about school.
12. The children enjoy attending visits with the biological parents.
13. At a recent visit, one of the boys stated that they now have control over what they eat and not the parents.
14. Dylan enjoys eating all foods.
15. The only food that Kenan hasn't enjoyed is jelly.
16. The children are doing great.
17. When the case initially opened, the biological parents refused to participate in services.
18. At the end of February 2019, the biological parents agreed to participate in visitations.
19. The biological parents consistently attend visits.
20. The biological mother is reported to be more open during feedback sessions than father. Also, that mother is more engaged in the visitations.
21. The biological parents are enrolled in counseling services.
22. She presumes that the biological mother completed a psychological evaluation on April 16, 2019.
23. The biological father has requested a Turkish interpreter for the psychological evaluation. The department was unable to locate an interpreter in state; therefore, is reaching out to interpreters in California.
24. The biological parents have given her certifications of parenting classes and medical classes. The only issue is that the parents took a class for children with special dietary needs, and the children do not have any dietary restrictions.

**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Observation/Concerns & Review Board Recommendations:

The Board is concerned about the following:

- The biological mother has voiced a desire to have telephone contact with Kenan and Dylan.
- Per the biological mother, several doctors have recommended genetic testing for Kenan and Dylan.
- The case manager is unaware of genetic testing recommendations.
- The biological parents are not permitted to attend the children's medical appointments.
- The biological mother has identified a nutritionist for the children post reunification, despite various medical professionals disputing the children's formerly reported dietary restrictions.
- The biological mother is concerned about the children's lack of growth since their removal.
- The established case plan goal target date listed within the progress report is unrealistic.

Therefore, the Board recommends the following:

- The Court consider the possibility of the biological parents attending medical appointments, to evaluate their understanding of the children's medical status.
- The biological mother attend the scheduled psychological evaluation.
- The case manager provide the results of the biological mother's psychological evaluation to the FCRB, prior to the next review.
- The Court consider telephone contact between the biological mother and the children.
- The case manager continue providing the biological mother with information related to the children's medical status.
- The case manager continue providing the biological mother with information related to the children's dietary needs.
- The biological parents continue efforts to participate in reunification services.
- The case manager establish a more realistic case plan goal target date that is appropriate for the current status of the case and document it in the next progress report.

Pursuant to A.R. S. 8-515.03, the Agency must respond, within 10 days of receipt, to accept or decline FCRB recommendations made specifically to case managers. Please email responses to RPTFCRB@courts.az.gov referencing the FCRB number, review date and child(ren) name, and title the subject line as "Agency 10 Day Response".

Administrative Notes:

None.

cc:

Parent Father, Biological For Dylan, Kenan
Attorney General - Attorney
Parent Mother, Biological For Dylan, Kenan
Judge Jennifer Green - Court

**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT
FOSTER CARE REVIEW BOARD
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Madison Bell - Case Manager For Dylan, Kenan

Mecca Temple - Case Manager Supervisor

Megan Haywood - Guardian Ad Litem For Dylan, Kenan

Placement Mother, Foster For Dylan, Kenan

Suzanne Nicholls - Attorney Father, Biological